

JUL 06 2005

ANDREW J. REED, JR.
BY _____ Deputy

Nos. 04-1144, 05-0145 and 05-0148

In The Supreme Court of Texas

*ALVARADO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,
Appellants*

v.

*SHIRLEY NEELEY, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS TEXAS
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY,
CAROL KEETON STRAYHORN, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS
TEXAS COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, AND
THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Appellees*

On Direct Appeal from the 250th District Court, Austin, Travis County, Texas

AMICUS BRIEF OF AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY – TEXAS

Potts & Reilly, L.L.P.
Marc A. Levin
State Bar No. 24039611
401 West 15th Street, Suite 850
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (512) 469-7474
Facsimile: (512) 469-7480

ATTORNEYS FOR AMERICANS FOR
PROSPERITY - TEXAS

IDENTITY OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL

Appellees/Plaintiffs are West Orange-Cove Independent School District, Edgewood Independent School District, Alvarado Independent School District, et al.

Counsel for Appellees/Plaintiffs: George W. Bramlett
Nina Cortell
Haynes and Boone, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75202-3789
Attorneys for West Orange-Cove ISD, et al.

Mark R. Trachtenberg
Haynes and Boone, LLP
1221 McKinney, Suite 2100
Houston, TX 77010
Attorney for West Orange-Cove ISD, et al.

J. David Thompson
Phillip Fraissinet
Bracewell & Giuliani, LLP
711 Louisiana St., Suite 2300
Houston, TX 77002-2770
Attorney for West Orange-Cove ISD, et al.

Randall B. Wood
Doug W. Ray
Ray, Wood, Fine & Bonilla, LLP
2700 Bee Caves Road
Austin, TX 78746
Attorneys for Alvarado I.S.D., et al.

David G. Hinojosa
Nina Perales
M.A.L.D.E.F.
140 E. Houston St., Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
Attorneys for Edgewood ISD, et al.

Appellants/Defendants are Shirley Neeley, In Her Official Capacity as Texas Commissioner of Education, Carole Keeton Strayhorn, In Her Official Capacity as Comptroller of Public Accounts, and the Texas State Board of Education.

Counsel for Appellants/Defendants: Greg Abbott, Attorney General
R. Ted. Cruz, Solicitor General

Amy Warr, Assistant Solicitor General
Danica L. Milios
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711-2548

Amicus Curiae is Americans for Prosperity – Texas.

Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*:

Marc A. Levin
Potts & Reilly, LLP
401 W. 15th St., Suite 850
Austin, TX 78701

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IDENTITIES OF PARTIES AND COUNSEL	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
INDEX OF AUTHORITIES	iv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	2
ARGUMENT	
I. Judiciary Not Empowered to Decide School Finance	3
II. No Correlation Between State Share of School Funding and Student Performance	4
III. Inefficiency and Inadequacy in Current System Does Not Result From Insufficient State Funding. But From School Districts Misdirecting Existing Funds Away from the Classroom	7
IV. State Mandates Are the Other Primary Source of Inefficiency and Their Invalidation Would Render Existing Funding Sufficient and Adequate	15
V. Remedy for Inadequacy or Inefficiency Should Be Reforms, Not More Funds	21
CONCLUSION AND PRAYER	25
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	27

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Edgewood Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Kirby</i> , 777 S.W.2d 391, 397 (Tex. 1989).....	3
--	---

STATUTES

Texas Educ. Code §§ 19.051(a)(1) and (2).....	22
Texas Educ. Code § 23.993	22

TEXAS CONSTITUTION

TEX. CONST. art. III, § 33	4
TEX. CONST. art. III § 35	3
TEX. CONST. art. III § 49a	3
TEX. CONST. art. VII, § 1	3
TEX. CONST. art. VIII, § 22	3

NEWS ARTICLES/BOOKS/WEBSITES

Joshua Benton and Robert Tharp. State audit set for W-H; School leaders are corrupt. police chief tells grand jury, <i>Dallas Morning News</i> , August 25, 2004, pg. 1A	23
Brain Based or Brain Dead?, <i>Texas Journal</i> , December 14, 2004, available at http://texasjournal.com/index.php/weblog/brainy_in_laredo/	12
Linda Darling-Hammond, Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence, 8 EDUC. POL'Y ANALYSIS ARCHIVES 1 (2000). available at http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1	20

Hess, Frederick, Teacher Quality, Teacher Pay, POLICY REVIEW, April 2004, available at http://www.policyreview.org/apr04/hess.html	19
Frederick M. Hess, <i>Revolution at the Margins</i> (Brookings Institution Press, 2002)	19
Holland, Kristen, District finances don't fit the mold; Students have done well without big spending, but officials want more, <i>Dallas Morning News</i> , April 21, 2004, pg. 1N	11
Caroline Minter Hoxby, The Effects of Private School Vouchers on Schools and Students, in <i>Holding Schools Accountable</i> 198 (Helen F. Ladd ed., 1996)	24
http://www.atpe.org/Publications/Spr_05capcom.htm	20
Kovach, Gretel, Wilmer board is overruled State overseers reverse most actions after trustees cancel meeting, <i>Dallas Morning News</i> , April 5, 2005, pg. 1B	23
Laredo ISD Prefers Litigation to Education, <i>Texas Journal</i> , June 27, 2005, available at http://texasjournal.com/index.php/weblog/laredo	12
Andrew Leigh and Sarah Mead, Lifting Teacher Performance, Progressive Policy Institute Report, April 2005, available at http://www.ppionline.org/documents/teachqual_0419.pdf	20
<i>Lone Star Report</i> , June 27, 2005, available at www.lonestarreport.org	9
Melendez, Michelle, Trustees Change Contract Criteria, <i>Fort Worth Star-Telegram</i> , January 7, 2001, pg. 1	12
Parks, Scott, "Bad Teachers Get Push Towards the Door," <i>Dallas Morning News</i> , February 3, 2002, pg. 1A	18, 19
Parks, Scott, School chiefs hobnob, profit \$2,000 in consulting fees offered to attend conferences with vendors, <i>Dallas Morning News</i> , July 18, 2004, pg. 1A	10
Parks, Scott, Your Turn: Suggestions from saving money in schools, <i>Dallas Morning News</i> , March 26, 2005. Available at http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/dn/education/columnists/sparks/stories/032805dnmetedparks.16f506239.html	11
Patterson, Chris, Crack open schools' books, <i>Austin American-Statesman</i> , April 28, 2005, available at http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2005-04-28-aas-books.pdf	11
Patterson Chris, "Paying for Education: What is the True Cost?," May 2004,	

available at http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2004-05-sf-payingforeduc.pdf	20
Patterson, Chris. "Quality Must Drive Teaching Standards," November 5, 2003. Available at http://www.texaspolicy.com/commentaries_single.php?report_id=401	17, 18
Reilly, Catherine, School and School District Consolidation: Major Concepts, June 9, 2004, available at www.umaine.edu/mcsc/Research/EcoDev/school1.pdf	13
Staff Editorial, Austin taxpayers asked to do too much, <i>Austin American-Statesman</i> , April 23, 2005, pg. A16.....	12
Staff Editorial, Contract clauses, <i>Dallas Morning News</i> , August 15, 2004, pg. 2A	10
Staff Editorial, Unlocking the Records, <i>Fort Worth Star-Telegram</i> , June 13, 2004, pg. 1E.....	10
Superintendents on the Take? <i>Texas Journal</i> , June 14, 2005, available at http://texasjournal.com/index.php/weblog/baksheesh/	10
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, available at http://www.window.state.tx.us/tpr/atg/atged/atged03.html	13
Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Increase Consolidation Incentives for School Districts, available at http://www.window.state.tx.us/tpr/atg/atged/atged03.html	22
Torres, McNelly, Top dollar for schools' top dogs; Trustees say superintendents are earning their pay, which has soared in recent years, <i>San Antonio Express-News</i> , March 8, 2004, pg. 1A	10
U.S. Department of Education, Profile of the Southwest Region, April 18, 2005, available at http://www.raced.org/Default.aspx?tabid=316&DMXModule=893&Download=inline&EntryId=980	8
Young Audiences of North Texas website available at http://www.yanorthtexas.org	11

LAW REVIEW ARTICLES/TREATISES

Kalyan Chakraborty, Basudeb Biswas, and W. Cris Lewis, Economies of Scale in Public Education: An Econometric Analysis. <i>CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC POLICY</i> (18)2 (2000)	13
William Duncombe, Jerry Miner, and John Ruggiero, Potential Cost Savings from	

School District Consolidation: A Case Study of New York. <i>ECONOMICS OF EDUC. REV.</i> (14)3 (1995)	13
David M. Engstrom, Civil Rights Paradox? Lawyers and Educational Equity. 10 <i>J.L. & POL'Y</i> 387, 412 (2002)	5
William A. Fischel, How Serrano Caused Proposition 13, 12 <i>J.L. & POL.</i> 607 620-21 (1996)	7
Eric A. Hanushek & Charles S. Benson, Making Schools Work: Improving Performance and Controlling Costs 25-49 (1994)	5
Eric A. Hanushek, When School Finance "Reform" May Not Be Good Policy. 29 <i>HARV. J. LEGIS.</i> 423 (1991)	5
Bradley W. Joondeph, The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly: An Empirical Analysis of Litigation-Prompted School Finance Reform, 35 <i>SANTA CLARA L. REV.</i> 763, 810-11 (1995)	6
Michael Lewyn, Suburban Sprawl: Not Just an Environmental Issue, 84 <i>MARQ. L. REV.</i> 301, 377 (2000)	5
Michael Podgursky, Reforming the Single Teacher Salary Schedule in Public Schools, <i>TEXAS EDUC. REVIEW</i> , Winter 2003-04 Available at http://www.educationreview.homestead.com/2003ReformingTeacherPay.html . . .	15, 16
Justin J. Sayfie, Education Emancipation for Inner City Students: A New Legal Paradigm for Achieving Equality of Educational Opportunity, 48 <i>U. MIAMI L. REV.</i> 913, 934 (1994).	5
Jon C. Sonstelie & Paul R. Portney, Take the Money and Run: A Theory of Voting in Local Referenda. 8 <i>J. URB. ECON.</i> 187 (1980)	7
Teacher Quality and Teacher Pay: An Interview with Richard Murnane, Thompson Professor of Education and Society, Harvard Graduate School of Education 7 <i>GEO. PUBLIC POL'Y REV.</i> 111, 111 (2002)	16
S. Paul Wright et. al., Teacher and Classroom Context Effects on Student Achievement: Implications for Teacher Evaluation, 11 <i>J. PERSONNEL EVALUATION IN EDUC.</i> 57, 61-63 (1997)	20

Nos. 04-1144, 05-0145 and 05-0148

In The Supreme Court of Texas

*ALVARADO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al.,
Appellants*

v.

*SHIRLEY NEELEY, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS TEXAS
COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY,
CAROL KEETON STRAYHORN, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS
TEXAS COMPTROLLER OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, AND
THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Appellees*

On Direct Appeal from the 250th District Court, Austin, Travis County, Texas

**AMICUS BRIEF OF AMERICANS FOR
PROSPERITY – TEXAS**

Potts & Reilly, L.L.P
Marc A. Levin
State Bar No. 24039611
401 West 15th Street, Suite 850
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (512) 469-7474
Facsimile: (512) 469-7480

ATTORNEYS FOR AMERICANS FOR
PROSPERITY - TEXAS

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE

Americans For Prosperity – Texas is an affiliate of Americans for Prosperity Foundation (AFPF), a non-profit organization with 22,000 members in the Lone Star State. AFPF is a nationwide organization of citizen leaders committed to advancing every individual's right to economic freedom and opportunity. AFPF believes reducing the size and scope of government is the best safeguard to ensuring individual productivity and prosperity for all Americans. AFPF educates and engages citizens in support of restraining state and federal government growth, and returning government to its constitutional limits.

The issues at stake in this case directly concern Americans for Prosperity – Texas and its members, who are taxpayers, parents, and students. The lower court decision by Judge John Dietz threatens to shut down Texas schools in October unless the Legislature addresses the violations Judge Dietz found by increasing state spending on government schools. Americans for Prosperity – Texas and its membership are deeply concerned that Judge Dietz's erroneous findings and conclusions, if allowed to stand by this Court, could result in an enormous tax increase without any educational benefits for Texas children. The root of this problem is that Judge Dietz failed to consider that there is no demonstrable correlation between education spending and results and that existing funding would certainly be sufficient if it were not being squandered on bloated administration, excessive salaries for administrators, fiscal mismanagement, unnecessary programs, and inefficient state mandates. Most critically, there is no guarantee that Judge Dietz's court-imposed, taxpayer-funded largesse for government schools will actually go towards expenses that improve classroom instruction. Americans for Prosperity – Texas

and its members, as well as the Texas economy and education system, will be gravely harmed if the outcome of this case results in the imposition of a new tax burden on Texans with no accountability or competition to ensure that any additional funds actually translate into better educational outcomes for Texas students.

ARGUMENT

I. Judiciary Not Empowered to Decide School Finance.

Initially, we agree with the Defendants that school finance is a political question that should be settled by the Legislature rather than this Court. Americans for Prosperity – Texas and its members believe that judicial lawmaking on complicated policy issues such as education and taxation interferes with the province of legislative bodies, which are better equipped to weigh competing goals and budgetary trade-offs that must necessarily be considered. We urge this Court to reverse *Edgewood Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Kirby*, 777 S.W.2d 391, 397 (Tex. 1989) and its progeny and thereby exit the school finance thicket, leaving this issue to the judgment of the Legislature.

In addition to the Defendants' arguments on this point, we would note that the constitutional provision at issue in this case provides that "it shall be the duty of the Legislature of the State...." TEX. CONST. art. VII, § 1. This language clearly connotes that it is the Legislature, not any court, which is vested with the sole authority to implement this constitutional provision. Furthermore, many constitutional provisions make clear that the Legislature has sole authority to determine appropriations. See TEX. CONST. art. III, § 35; TEX. CONST. art. III, § 49a; TEX. CONST. art. VIII, § 22. Similarly,

the relief granted by Judge Dietz, which requires increased state funding of government schools, essentially requires a tax increase in violation of the Texas Constitution's requirement that tax policy originate in the Texas House, not the judiciary. *See* TEX. CONST. art. III, § 33. Because it would effectively require the Legislature to increase appropriations and raise taxes, Judge Dietz's ruling is itself unconstitutional as it exceeds the province of the judiciary and tramples on the authority of the Legislature.

Second, we urge this Court to agree with the Defendants that the Plaintiffs lack standing to pursue this case because it is nothing more than the state suing itself. It is paradoxical that school districts, themselves political subdivisions of the State, would have standing to sue the state for more money. This precedent would seemingly allow for limitless suits at the taxpayers' expense. Can cities, counties, or even individual state agencies now sue the state for more funding? Allowing such self-serving legal actions between state entities circumvents the other branches of government, particularly the legislative budget process, and creates unlimited liabilities for taxpayers, as illustrated by the over \$3.8 million in legal fees that the district court awarded plaintiffs' and intervenors' attorneys at taxpayer expense, not to mention the time that the state's taxpayer-funded lawyers have invested in this case.

II. No Correlation Between State Share of School Funding and Student Performance.

The lower court decision is fatally flawed because it presumes, without any supporting evidence, that there is a connection between increased funding and student performance.

The most robust social scientific finding of the past four decades is an enduring and high correlation between academic achievement and family socio-economic status. David M. Engstrom, Civil Rights Paradox? Lawyers and Educational Equity, 10 J.L. & POL'Y 387, 412 (2002). There is no systematic relationship between educational inputs and outputs. See Eric A. Hanushek & Charles S. Benson, Making Schools Work: Improving Performance and Controlling Costs 25-49 (1994); Eric A. Hanushek, When School Finance "Reform" May Not Be Good Policy, 29 HARV. J. LEGIS. 423 (1991). "[T]here is little correlation between school spending and educational achievement." Michael Lewyn, Suburban Sprawl: Not Just an Environmental Issue, 84 MARQ. L. REV. 301, 377 (2000). "The reality is that educational outcomes depend on a staggeringly complex web of variables and value judgments that, despite the best efforts of education experts to find consensus, remain deeply contested." David M. Engstrom, Civil Rights Paradox? Lawyers and Educational Equity, 10 J.L. & POL'Y 387, 412 (2002).

The absence of a positive correlation between educational spending and student performance is evidenced in the 1991 National Assessment of Educational Progress testing of eighth-graders' math skills. "North Dakota, ranked 32nd in the nation in terms of per-pupil spending, performed the best while the District of Columbia, which spends the most per student, finished second to last." Justin J. Sayfie, Education Emancipation for Inner City Students: A New Legal Paradigm for Achieving Equality of Educational Opportunity, 48 U. MIAMI L. REV. 913, 934 (1994). "Utah spent less money per student than every other state in the union in 1992, \$2,993, yet ranked 4th and 8th respectively among all states in SAT and NAEP scores." *Id.*

There is more recent evidence right here in Texas of the lack of any correlation between per student spending and student performance. For example, Texas Education Agency statistics show that the three districts that have the lowest cost per student – Texhoma, Red Lick, and Wyle (Taylor) ISDs – are all rated either recognized or exemplary despite per pupil costs below \$5,000. See Exhibit 1. Conversely, Reagan County, with a per pupil cost of \$9,702 per student, one of the highest of any medium-sized districts, is rated unacceptable. Similarly, Dime Box ISD has a per pupil cost of \$9,635 but is also deemed unacceptable.

Even assuming there is a correlation between school funding and student performance, there is no evidence that a greater share of such funding coming from the state as opposed to from local taxpayers, results in higher overall funding. Indeed, there is significant research showing the contrary. Evidence from states whose courts have promoted centralized school spending suggests that increased state financing is more likely to reduce average spending relative to that of other states. See Bradley W. Joondeph, *The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly: An Empirical Analysis of Litigation-Prompted School Finance Reform*, 35 SANTA CLARA L. REV. 763, 810-11 (1995) (study of six school districts finding that court orders in school finance litigation requiring increased centralized state spending actually reduced overall rate of increase in expenditures for education). William Fischel, Professor of Economics at Dartmouth College, explains that centralizing a greater share of education spending tends to reduce total education spending because funding at the local level provides a greater financial incentive for taxpayers and voters to support the education of other people's children, even if they do not have children in government schools. He notes: "Capitalization of the

benefits of education into individual property values makes it rational for even childless people who own homes larger than those with one bedroom to offer support for education.” William A. Fischel, *How Serrano Caused Proposition 13*, 12 J.L. & POL. 607, 620-21 (1996). Evidence for this theory was provided by economists Jon Sonstelie and Paul Portney in their study of the City of South San Francisco, which demonstrated that voters took account of expected property value changes resulting from school tax referenda in 1970. *See* Jon C. Sonstelie & Paul R. Portney, *Take the Money and Run: A Theory of Voting in Local Referenda*, 8 J. URB. ECON. 187 (1980).

In sum, there is insufficient evidence to meet the Plaintiffs’ burden of establishing that increasing the state share of spending on education will increase aggregate spending on education and, furthermore, that additional funds will result in improvements in student academic performance.

III. Inefficiency and Inadequacy in Current System Does Not Result From Insufficient State Funding, But From School Districts Misdirecting Existing Funds Away from the Classroom.

To the extent that the current system of government schools, or some school districts, provide an education that is unconstitutionally inefficient and inadequate, the primary source of this infirmity is not a lack of state funding, but rather the gross misuse of existing funds.

For one thing, Texas already spends more per student on K-12 education than any of its surrounding states – Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and New Mexico. Even adjusted for Texas’ higher cost of living compared to those states, Texas spent an average

of \$6,937 per student during the time period at issue in this litigation compared with \$6,756 in Louisiana, \$6,390 in Arkansas, \$6,676 in Oklahoma, and \$6,794 in New Mexico.¹ Furthermore, Texas pays its teachers an average salary that is more than \$3,000 higher than any one of these states.² If this Court upholds Judge Dietz's determination that Texas' current level of education funding is inadequate and unsuitable, the Court will also effectively be condemning the lower level of education funding in every state bordering Texas and the considered judgments of their legislative bodies as well as the Texas Legislature.

In fact, the overwhelming evidence indicates that the problems the plaintiffs complain of are not due to inadequate state funding, but their own misdirection of funds away from the classroom and their squandering of funds on superfluous layers of administration, excessive salaries for administrators, and mind-boggling boondoggles. First, many districts are diverting a disproportionate share of their revenues into bloated bureaucracies. In fact, Exhibit 1 shows that West-Orange Cove ISD spends only 32.4 percent of its funds on classroom-related expenditures. This is the fourth worst figure of any district in the state of Texas and is indicative of gross mismanagement, putting them in no equitable position to demand more money from state taxpayers to bankroll their wasteful spending habits. Although their mismanagement is not nearly as wretched as West-Orange Cove, both Edgewood and Alvarado ISDS devote less than 50 percent of their resources to the classroom, placing them in the bottom half of all Texas school districts. These districts should be required to at least meet the state average for directing a percentage of their resources to student learning before they are heard to complain of

¹ U.S. Department of Education, Profile of the Southwest Region, April 18, 2005, available at [http://www.rac-ed.org/Default.aspx?tabid=316&DMXModule=\\$93&Download=inline&EntryId=980](http://www.rac-ed.org/Default.aspx?tabid=316&DMXModule=$93&Download=inline&EntryId=980).
² *Id.*

inadequate state funding. Moreover, as Governor Rick Perry and Texas House Public Education Committee Chairman Kent Grusendorf have stated, at least 65 percent of education spending should be directed to classroom-related expenditures.³

A significant cause of this misuse of existing resources is a glut of non-teaching staff. For example, West-Orange Cove is in the bottom 20 percent of all Texas school districts with only 9.6 students for every non-teaching staff member it employs. Remarkably, Dripping Springs ISD, which like West-Orange Cove ISD has approximately 3,200 students, manages to get by with 159.8 students for each non-teaching staff member.⁴ Indeed, Dripping Springs is rated recognized while West-Orange Cove is rated acceptable, despite, or perhaps partly because, of its surplus of non-teaching staff. The Plaintiffs have provided zero evidence that excess levels of non-teaching staff increases student achievement. In fact, such larded layers of bureaucracy likely create more hoops for teachers to jump through, more paperwork, and other inefficiencies which tend to reduce teacher effectiveness and, perhaps therefore, undermine student achievement. The fact is that, in too many Texas communities, school districts view their roles as employers as much as educators and Judge Dietz's decision will only perpetuate this pork-laden gravy train without any attendant educational benefits.

This misuse of resources and inefficiency is further compounded by the excessive salaries many districts pay their administrative staff. Superintendent salaries have grown

³ See *Lone Star Report*, June 27, 2005, available at www.lonestarreport.org

⁴ Edgewood ISD is also well below average, coming in at #267 with only 10.6 students for every non-teaching staff member. Alvarado ISD is slightly above average at #581 with 13.8 students per non-teaching staff member.

as much as 77 percent in the last five years.⁵ The average base salary for superintendents in Texas increased 7 percent in 2002-03, according to a computer analysis by the *San Antonio Express-News* of 1,134 school districts and charter schools while teachers' salaries increased only 1.7 percent in that same period according to a survey by the Texas Association of School Boards. *Id.* For example, the superintendent of San Antonio ISD makes \$273,305 and his contract calls for a minimum 7.5 percent salary increase annually. *Id.* Beaumont ISD lavishes \$281,567 on its superintendent, even though it is not one of the state's largest districts. *Id.* Arlington ISD pays its superintendent some \$190,000 in addition to a wide assortment of benefits, such as a petty cash fund of \$4,010 and a \$780.25 a month auto and mobile phone allowance that truly takes taxpayers for a ride.⁶ In addition to their taxpayer-funded salaries and perks, the *Dallas Morning News* recently exposed the following superintendents for their crass conflict of interest in lining their pockets with thousands in consulting fees from vendors their districts contract with: Annette Griffin, Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD; Nadine Kujawa, Aldine ISD; Bill McKinney, Region IV education Service Center (Houston); Leonard Merrell, Katy ISD; Hector Montenegro, Ysleia ISD; Mike Moses, Dallas ISD; Ruben Olivarez, San Antonio ISD; Doug Otto, Plano ISD; Rick Schneider, Pasadena ISD; Kevin Singer, Grapevine-Colleyville ISD; Keith Sockwell, Northwest ISD; and Jim Surratt, Klein ISD.⁷

In addition to superintendents, other central administrators also make sizable salaries, draining more money from the classroom. The average central administrator

⁵ Torres, McNelly, Top dollar for schools' top dogs: Trustees say superintendents are earning their pay, which has soared in recent years. *San Antonio Express-News*, March 8, 2004, pg. 1A.

⁶ Staff Editorial, Unlocking the Records. *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, June 13, 2004, pg. 1E.

⁷ See Parks, Scott, School chiefs hobnob, profit \$2,000 in consulting fees offered to attend conferences with vendors. *Dallas Morning News*, July 18, 2004, pg. 1A; Staff Editorial, Contract clauses. *Dallas Morning News*, August 15, 2004, pg. 2A; Superintendents on the Take?, *Texas Journal*, June 14, 2005, available at <http://texasjournal.com/index.php/weblog/baksheesh/>.

salary statewide was \$72,252 in 2004, and significantly higher in many of the plaintiff and intervenor districts.⁵ For example, the average Dallas ISD central administrator is paid \$83,736 while only a few miles away Highland Park ISD pays its central administrators an average of \$106,851. *Id.*

Beyond employing too many administrators and paying them too much, many school districts spend money on countless other non-classroom expenses that are either unnecessary or could be privatized. Unnecessary non-classroom expenditures include junkets for administrators and funds spent to retain consultants and legislative lobbyists. "The *Dallas Morning News* reported on the seven-member cohort of Allen educators who flew to Austin to lobby for a day at \$210 per flight. I'm estimating with big meals and rental cars, this trip cost upwards of \$2,000."⁹ One retired superintendent from a Dallas area school district will be paid a \$75,000 "consulting fee" for 2005-06.¹⁰

The Texas Public Policy Foundation has identified almost \$5 million dollars of waste in Dallas ISD alone, including \$1.6 million for lawyers, \$375,000 for various chambers of commerce, \$14,500 for Billie Arbuckle Adventures, and \$2.7 million for the Young Audiences of North Texas, which sponsors hardly essential after-school programs in areas such as puppetry, flamenco and African drumming.¹¹ Meanwhile, Laredo ISD Superintendent Sylvia Bruni has implemented programs training students in yoga,

⁵ Holland, Kristen. District finances don't fit the mold: Students have done well without big spending, but officials want more. *Dallas Morning News*, April 21, 2004, pg. 1N.

⁹ Parks, Scott. Your Turn: Suggestions from saving money in schools. *Dallas Morning News*, March 26 2005. Available at <http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/dn/education/columnists/sparks/stories/032805dnmetedparks.16f506239.html>.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ Patterson, Chris. Crack open schools' books. *Austin American-Statesman*, April 28, 2005, available at <http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2005-04-28-aas-books.pdf>; see also Young Audiences of North Texas website available at <http://www.yanorthtexas.org>.

breathing exercises, and water consumption.¹² At the same time, Laredo ISD, along with the National Education Association, the Texas State's Teachers Association, and eight other school districts, is now suing the federal government over the No Child Left Behind Act to obtain still more taxpayer funds.¹³

Districts could also achieve significant savings by privatizing non-classroom functions, such as transportation and dining. Additionally, while the Plaintiffs complain about their facilities, they have failed to show that they are efficiently utilizing their existing funds for construction. In fact, Fort Worth ISD has discontinued awarding construction contracts to the low bidder, moving instead to a system based on subjective criteria such as a contractor's race and residency in the school district.¹⁴ Earlier this year, Austin ISD chose to increase its construction costs by caving into demands by union bosses and liberal activists to provide health insurance for the employees of construction contractors that the *Austin American-Statesman* estimates will rob taxpayers and students of \$10 to \$15 million that could have been used for facilities.¹⁵

Finally, there are far too many school districts in Texas, but because they are so tethered to their own administrative nests, districts have refused to consolidate with one another even when it would clearly increase the efficiency and adequacy of the system. Texas has some 1,032 school districts. Remarkably, as Exhibit 1 shows, 37 of these districts have fewer than 100 students. Moreover, 544 districts – more than half of all districts – have fewer than 1,000 students. Amazingly, 15 districts have more non-

¹² Brain Based or Brain Dead?, *Texas Journal*, December 14, 2004, available at http://texasjournal.com/index.php/weblog/brainy_in_laredo/.

¹³ Laredo ISD Prefers Litigation to Education, *Texas Journal*, June 27, 2005, available at <http://texasjournal.com/index.php/weblog/laredo/>.

¹⁴ Melendez, Michelle, Trustees Change Contract Criteria, *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, January 7, 2001, pg. 1.

¹⁵ Staff Editorial, Austin taxpayers asked to do too much, *Austin American-Statesman*, April 23, 2005, pg. A16

teaching staff than students. Some 228 districts have less than ten students per non-teaching staff member.

Not surprisingly, Exhibit 1 illustrates that the smallest Texas school districts tend to have the highest per student cost. Academic research has clearly demonstrated that, due to economies of scale, it is inefficient to have a plethora of very small school districts. See Kalyan Chakraborty, Basudeb Biswas, and W. Cris Lewis, *Economics of Scale in Public Education: An Econometric Analysis*, CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC POLICY (18)2 (2000). One author notes, "The observation that per-pupil costs decrease as enrollment increases from very low levels is generally not disputed."¹⁶

There is also evidence specific to Texas of the inefficiency associated with a surfeit of small districts. The Comptroller of Public Accounts recently noted, "Since there is a higher cost associated with providing a comprehensive educational program in districts with fewer than 1,600 students, Texas spends approximately \$325 million each year (through the small-district adjustment) to help those small districts. Even with additional funding, it appears that some districts are unable to offer the minimum number of courses required by the state."¹⁷ The Comptroller concluded, "Consolidation of even very small school districts can result in a higher quality educational program for the students and a more efficient use of scarce resources."¹⁸ Indeed, in addition to eliminating the inefficiency associated with redundant layers of administration, there is evidence that school district consolidation improves academic performance. See William Duncombe, Jerry Miner, and John Ruggiero, *Potential Cost Savings from School District*

¹⁶ Reilly, Catherine, *School and School District Consolidation: Major Concepts*, June 9, 2004, available at www.umaine.edu/mcsc/Research/EcoDev/school1.pdf.

¹⁷ Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, available at <http://www.window.state.tx.us/tpr/atg/atged/atged03.html>.

¹⁸ *Id.*

Consolidation: A Case Study of New York. *ECONOMICS OF EDUC. REV.* (14)3 (1995) (showing found that New York students in larger school districts tended to perform better on the state's high school Regents Examination and that performance on Regents was highest in districts of between 1,000 and 5,000 pupils). This study of New York districts attributed some of the better performance to the wider range of courses, including college preparatory courses, offered in larger school districts.

Furthermore, the resistance of the plaintiffs, intervenors, and other school districts to consolidation is in large measure responsible for the disparities in the tax base for which they now seek extraordinary judicial relief. Fewer school districts would result in a broader average tax base for each district, reducing the disparities of which the plaintiffs complain, thereby both decreasing the number of districts that purportedly have no choice but to tax at the maximum rate, the number of districts from whom recapture dollars are taken, and the number of districts to whom recapture dollars are redistributed. Consequently, the evidence on the issue of consolidation demonstrates yet again that the plaintiffs' inadequacies and inefficiencies are largely of their own making.

In sum, the plaintiffs are largely responsible for their own admitted inefficiencies and inadequacies in educating students because their own decisions result in the gross misallocation of resources away from the classroom. On equitable grounds alone, these plaintiffs have unclean hands and they should not be allowed to raid the state's coffers until they put their own fiscal houses in order.

IV. State Mandates Are the Other Primary Source of Inefficiency and Their Repeal Would Render Existing Funding Sufficient and Adequate.

If this Court determines that the existing system does not meet the state's alleged constitutional obligation to provide an adequate and efficient educational system, the Court should nonetheless reject Judge Dietz's conclusion that this is due to a lack of state funding. Instead, the evidence demonstrates that existing state funds, if they are not now sufficient to provide an adequate education, would be sufficient if this Court were to strike down inefficient state mandates that drive up costs while producing no discernable educational benefits. At the least, the Court should give the Legislature the option of eliminating these mandates as opposed to taking the costly actions effectively mandated by Judge Dietz.

The first such inefficient mandate is the uniform teacher salary schedule. This state effectively requires school districts to adopt salary schedules that are grossly inefficient. Under such schedules, all teachers are paid the same according to their years of experience, regardless of their effectiveness, or lack thereof. This system is exceedingly inefficient for at least three separate reasons identified by Michael Podgursky, who is Chairman of the Department of Economics at the University of Missouri at Columbia. See Michael Podgursky, Reforming the Single Teacher Salary Schedule in Public Schools, TEXAS EDUC. REVIEW, Winter 2003-04.¹⁹ These are differences by field, differences by quality of teaching performance, and differences by school. *Id.* With regard to differences by field, the current teacher salary scale is in large measure responsible for the lack of good teachers in fields such as math, science, and bilingual education because teachers in these fields cannot be paid more, even though

¹⁹ Available at <http://www.educationreview.homestead.com/2003ReformingTeacherPay.html>.

their services are generally in higher demand in the private sector than teachers in other fields.²⁰ Podgursky also notes that Texas' teacher pay scale fails to provide an incentive for teachers to maximize their performance and reduces the morale of high-performing and hard-working teachers who see their less committed counterparts make the same salaries although they put in less effort and leave earlier. Finally, Podgursky points out that fixed teacher salary schedules are inefficient because they do not adjust for the fact that it is more difficult and less desirable to teach in some schools, particularly those in more dangerous areas with student populations that have higher rates of disciplinary infractions, including violence against teachers. Podgursky concludes:

Most southern states maintain state-wide minimum salary schedules. By default, these state-wide schedules become the actual schedules for many districts, and form a benchmark for many more. However, I am unaware of any careful analysis or economic rationale justifying the structure of these schedules. Why does it take 29 years to reach the top of the North Carolina schedule but only 15 to top out in Tennessee? Why is the ratio of MA-max to MA-min. 180 percent in North Carolina, but only 152 percent in South Carolina, and 124 percent in Alabama?

Compensation policy is not something that is efficiently designed or implemented from state capitols. State-policy makers simply do not have adequate information to design the best compensation policy for hundreds of local districts and thousands of schools. In light of the inefficiencies associated with the single salary schedule, the best course of action for state policy-makers who seek to regulate wage-setting by local districts would be to limit their efforts to setting (and funding) competitive minimum starting pay for school teachers. How districts choose to structure their pay beyond starting salaries, and which teacher credentials or training is rewarded ought to be left to local school administrators.

Id. (emphasis added)

²⁰ "[I]t is problematic to have science and math teachers be paid the same as teachers in fields that do not have as attractive salaries as the sciences. Doing so results in shortages of math and science teachers." Teacher Quality and Teacher Pay: An Interview with Richard Murnane, Thompson Professor of Education and Society, Harvard Graduate School of Education 7 GEO. PUBLIC POL'Y REV. 111, 111 (2002).

In addition to the inefficiency of the rigid teacher salary schedule, the state's system of teacher certification is a major source of inefficiency and inadequacy. This system places too much emphasis on training in pedagogy and not enough on actual, real-world knowledge of the subject matter, particularly in the sciences. The result is that the increasingly large pool of early retirees from fields such as medicine and engineering, who would be willing to teach at least part-time and in many cases do not need the money, are unable to do so. Reforming the state's outmoded teacher certification scheme would result in cost savings and better teacher quality, improving both the efficiency and adequacy of the system.

Texas Public Policy Foundation Director of Research Chris Patterson explains, "Over the past decade, empirical research has been very clear about this problem. There is no consistent valid research that demonstrates fully certified teachers, produced by traditional colleges of education, are more effective than teachers who come to the classroom through other means, according to the State Board for Educator Certification. In fact, teacher effectiveness correlates better with deep subject area knowledge and verbal skills than with teacher certification."²¹ Patterson further explains:

Today, our state requirements for teacher certification neither produce nor ensure teacher quality. On the contrary, these requirements act as a bar to some highly qualified individuals who would like to teach. Although Texas has developed an alternative teaching certificate, and approximately 15 percent of teachers are now certified by completing educator programs established by institutions other than universities, this alternative offers little flexibility and innovation.

An all too common example is that of a successful businessman we recently met in Dallas. Holding a Ph.D. in geology, he had worked with political leaders from around the world. Upon retirement, he decided a way to give back to Texas was to pass on his knowledge and experience as

²¹ Patterson, Chris, "Quality Must Drive Teaching Standards," November 5, 2003. Available at http://www.texaspolicy.com/commentaries_single.php?report_id=401.

a high school science teacher. He was told, despite his credentials, he needed to spend two years in college to learn how to be a teacher. He did that, passing the required tests with flying colors. He was then told he needed to spend a school year as a practice teacher. For this man, that proved too much and he dropped the idea. He lost nothing but some time. Students, though, lost the opportunity to learn at the feet of an amazing resource.

If the state certification system is to serve children, certification must be redefined and the barriers torn down. Proven teaching abilities that underwrite student success must be the sole basis for certification – subject area knowledge and good verbal skills. Current requirements, except those pertaining to student safety, should be eliminated. Full discretion should be given to school districts for hiring and orienting new teachers to meet their unique classroom needs.²²

State law also promotes inefficiency and inadequacy by making it too difficult to relieve ineffective teachers of their duties. "Texas employment law and teacher contract provisions make it difficult for principals to get rid of experienced teachers. They can rarely be fired on the spot unless they become criminals or blatantly derelict."²³ Current law - the Term Contract Nonrenewal Act of 1981 - requires school districts to notify a teacher 45 days before dismissal and to offer that person the option of a hearing before the school board.²⁴ An independent hearing officer must advise the board on its ruling. Mary Smith, a principal at Emerson Elementary School in Midland, Texas, told the *Dallas Morning News* she has fired only three teachers in 13 years and that the hardest teacher to get rid of is the one who wants to do the minimum and draw a paycheck.²⁵ She notes:

²² *Id.*

²³ Parks, Scott, "Bad Teachers Get Push Towards the Door," *Dallas Morning News*, February 3, 2002, pg. 1A.

²⁴ Staff Editorial, "Middle Ground," *Fort Worth Star-Telegram*, February 22, 2003, pg. 12.

²⁵ Parks, Scott, "Bad Teachers Get Push Towards the Door," *Dallas Morning News*, February 3, 2002, pg. 1A.

One was very disorganized. Her classroom was drab, and there was nothing on the walls. She had no tolerance for kids. Often, the lights in her classroom weren't on. She wanted to sit at her desk and read her books while the kids read something else silently. It took me two years to get rid of her. I got her on her lack of lesson plans and on my personal observations.

Id.

Similarly, education scholar Frederick Hess reports:

One high-ranking Texas district official wryly explained what it takes to fire a teacher in that nonunion state: Firing incompetent teachers for poor performance or for engaging in misconduct is as time consuming and demanding as trying to convict someone of a crime. . . . Are we saying it can't be done? Of course not. What we are saying is that it requires almost 100 percent of a principal's time to hope to win a case to fire one bad teacher.²⁶

Nationally, public school districts report dismissing about one teacher a year for low performance.²⁷ This amounts to a rate of well under 1 percent, compared to a rate of 4.9 percent in charter schools.²⁸ Public school teachers have been caught sticking a child's head in a toilet, reading the newspaper while children gambled in the back of the room, and missing weeks or months of school at a stretch and yet kept their jobs.²⁹

In sum, by repealing the state laws that compromise school efficiency and adequacy by making it too difficult and cumbersome to fire incompetent and ineffective teachers, the efficiency and adequacy of Texas schools can be improved without any additional state funding.

Another state mandate that undermines efficiency and adequacy is the class size requirement. The Legislature enacted a class size law in 1984 requiring a maximum of

²⁶ Hess, Frederick, *Teacher Quality, Teacher Pay*, POLICY REVIEW, April 2004, available at <http://www.policyreview.org/apr04/hess.html>.

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ See Frederick M. Hess, *Revolution at the Margins* (Brookings Institution Press, 2002).

22 students for every teacher in grades K-4.³⁰ In reality, state restrictions on class size have reduced the average number of students in Texas K-3 classrooms to only 18.³¹ However, recent research using value-added student achievement data have found that student achievement gains are much more influenced by a student's assigned teacher than other factors like class size. See S. Paul Wright et. al., *Teacher and Classroom Context Effects on Student Achievement: Implications for Teacher Evaluation*, 11 J. PERSONNEL EVALUATION IN EDUC. 57, 61-63 (1997). Class size has, at best, negligible effects on student achievement. See Linda Darling-Hammond, *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence*, 8 EDUC. POL'Y ANALYSIS ARCHIVES 1 (2000), available at <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1>. Moreover, artificial limits on class size by definition require hiring more teachers, some of whom are not as qualified as those hired before them. This compromises both efficiency and adequacy because the research, as documented by the Progressive Policy Institute, overwhelmingly demonstrates that teacher effectiveness has a far greater impact on student achievement than class size.³² By lifting this unfunded state class size mandate and giving school districts discretion to balance class size with other educational priorities, efficiency and adequacy can be enhanced without any additional state funding.

Ultimately, if this Court decides the issues of efficiency and adequacy, it should either hold that the state mandates discussed above are inconsistent with an efficient and adequate school system or, at the very least, make clear that the Legislature has the

³⁰ See http://www.atpe.org/Publications/Spr_05capcom.htm.

³¹ Patterson Chris, "Paying for Education: What is the True Cost?," May 2004, available at <http://www.texaspolicy.com/pdf/2004-05-sf-payingforeduc.pdf>.

³² Andrew Leigh and Sarah Mead, *Lifting Teacher Performance*, Progressive Policy Institute Report, April 2005, available at http://www.ppionline.org/documents/teachqual_0419.pdf.

discretion to enhance efficiency and adequacy of the existing system by repealing these costly and counterproductive mandates rather than providing any additional state funding.

V. Remedy for Inadequacy or Inefficiency Should Be Reforms, Not More Funds.

If allowed to stand by this Court, Judge Dietz's order can only be interpreted as a mandate that the Legislature appropriate significantly more money to government schools, which would result in a sizable tax increase, perhaps even a job-killing state income tax. In his orders of declaratory relief, Dietz proclaimed that "the constitutional mandate of adequacy exceeds the maximum amount of funding that is available under the State's current funding formulas"; "the school finance system fails to recognize or cover the costs of meeting the constitutional mandate of adequacy;" and that "the current funding capacity of the Texas school finance system fails to provide Intervenor districts with sufficient access to revenue to provide for a general diffusion of knowledge to their students..." Because Judge Dietz did not consider the waste and misuse of funds by school districts themselves or the inefficient state mandates that raise costs, the relief he ordered does not include any requirement that the new funding be directed to the classroom or be tied to performance standards.

Even if this Court upholds Judge Dietz's findings that Texas' current education system, or at least some districts, are inefficient and inadequate, the Court should modify the relief ordered by Judge Dietz. There are many policy approaches that the Legislature might take to improve the efficiency and adequacy with which educational services are delivered to Texas children, many of which would not involve increasing state funding. However, the specificity of the relief granted by Judge Dietz, without any basis in fact or law, excludes the possibility of these alternative approaches and, in so doing, deviates

from the appropriate role of the judiciary and tramples on the fundamental constitutional role of the Legislature to select from among different policy options. Moreover, by lifting some of the state mandates on school districts and encouraging or forcing small districts to consolidate, the Legislature could decrease the number of districts that claim they must tax at the cap rate, which would also reduce the number of districts that truly need to tax at the property tax cap, which Judge Dietz concluded creates a de facto statewide property tax.

There are numerous such options that the Legislature could pursue to cure the purported inefficiencies and inadequacies identified by Judge Dietz. First, the Legislature could require that districts direct a certain percentage of educational funds to the classroom. This would force districts to streamline their bloated administrations, resulting in more money for instructional expenses without any additional spending by the state.

The Legislature could also require inefficiently small districts in close proximity with one another to consolidate. Even short of that, the Comptroller has recommended reforms to encourage consolidation.³³ Consolidation would reduce inefficiencies and free up additional funds for instructional-related expenses.

The Legislature could also limit the number of non-teaching staff per student and cap salaries for superintendents and other administrators. While local control remains an

³³ A. The Texas Education Code, Sections 19.051(a)(1) and (2), governing school district consolidation should be modified to remove the requirement that two or more school districts must be contiguous to consolidate. B. Texas Education Code, Section 23.993, restricting eligibility to receive incentive aid payments to districts which contain at least 750 students or a majority of students in the county containing the majority of the land area following consolidation, and Section 23.994, restricting the use of incentive aid payments to the retirement of existing bonded indebtedness, should be repealed. Section 23.999, which deals with county-line school districts whose consolidation results in fewer than 750 children in average daily attendance, should also be repealed. See Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts, Increase Consolidation Incentives for School Districts, available at <http://www.window.state.tx.us/tpr/atg/atged/atged03.html>.

important principle. taxpayers in Chapter 41 recapture districts should not be forced to pay for waste in school districts that they cannot affect by voting in local school board elections. Minimum state standards for administrative efficiency and fiscal responsibility would, once again, free up more money to cover classroom-related expenses that might actually have some educational benefit.

The Legislature could also improve performance by providing financial incentives for those districts, schools, and teachers that improve student performance. For example, by requiring that some percentage of existing teacher salaries be based on merit, teacher effectiveness can be enhanced. Additionally, the Legislature can improve the efficiency and adequacy of the current system by changing state law so that it is not as difficult to terminate bad teachers.

The Legislature could also abolish the current class size mandate that compromises efficiency and adequacy. This would enable districts to relieve the least effective teachers of their duties, improving the average quality of their teaching faculties. It would also allow districts to devote the savings to expenses that would have some correlation with educational outcomes.

Furthermore, the Legislature or the courts can place districts and schools that continue to fail due to mismanagement under court orders and receivership. Such districts can be reconstituted from the ground-up to root out institutional policies and practices that perpetuate failure. Most recently, this has occurred with Wilmer Hutchins ISD, where gross fiscal mismanagement and corruption eventually led to the intervention of state auditors and court orders.³⁴ Through the use of such aggressive oversight action

³⁴ Joshua Benton and Robert Tharp, State audit set for W-H: School leaders are corrupt, police chief tells grand jury, *Dallas Morning News*, August 25, 2004, pg. 1A; Kovach, Gretel, Wilmer board is overruled

in other districts, the state can ensure that existing funds are properly used and provide an incentive for all districts to ensure that they are adhering to sound financial management practices.

Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, the best way to improve the efficiency and adequacy of any system is through competition. Rather than providing education funding to institutions and bureaucracies, the most equitable and efficient way to disperse education dollars would be to empower parents with the ability to direct their children's education. Parents know the educational environment where their children have the greatest opportunity to learn. By providing for public and private school choice, the Legislature can both improve the educational outcomes of the students liberated from failing government schools and provide an incentive for failing districts and schools to either improve or shut down. "The reasonable conclusion is that private school tuition subsidies force public schools into higher productivity." See Caroline Minter Hoxby, *The Effects of Private School Vouchers on Schools and Students, in Holding Schools Accountable* 198 (Helen F. Ladd ed., 1996). Again, public and private school choice can be implemented to vastly improve the efficiency and adequacy of the existing system without any additional expenditure of state funds. All that is required is to put the most or all of the existing funds spent per student directly in the hands of parents.

In sum, the relief ordered by Judge Dietz is arbitrary and capricious because there are many ways that the efficiency and adequacy of Texas schools could be improved aside from more state funding. Many of these approaches could also lessen the supposed need for districts to tax at the maximum capped rate. Ultimately, even if this Court upholds Judge Dietz's findings of fact and conclusions of law, it should modify the relief

granted and advise the Legislature that they are free to choose from a variety of proposals for improving Texas' educational system, including those suggested herein.

CONCLUSION AND PRAYER

Americans for Prosperity – Texas first asks this Court to reverse the lower court judgment and, once and for all, extricate itself and the entire Texas judiciary from the policy question of school finance. Short of that, we ask this Court to reverse Judge Dietz's ruling because there is no connection between spending per student and educational outcomes. Furthermore, the overwhelming evidence indicates that the inadequacies and inefficiencies that exist in Texas' education system are primarily the result of school districts' own failures and, secondarily, burdensome state mandates, not a lack of state funding. Finally, we urge this Court to, at the very least, modify the relief Judge Dietz granted, which amounts to judicial policymaking that puts the Legislature in a straitjacket by requiring the most expensive, and arguably the least effective, approach to improving our education system. Even if it upholds Judge Dietz's determination that the current system is inefficient and inadequate, this Court should make clear that the Legislature may choose from among a wide array of policy proposals to address this constitutional infirmity, many of which do not involve additional state spending and the attendant increased tax burden on Texas families.

Respectfully submitted,



MARC A. LEVIN
State Bar No. 24039611

Attorney for *Amicus Curiae* Americans for Prosperity - Texas
Potts & Reilly L.L.P.
401 W. 15th St., Suite 850
Austin, TX 78701
Telephone (512) 469-7474
Facsimile (512) 469-7480

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was sent to the following on this 5th day of July, 2005 as follows:

Counsel for Appellees/Plaintiffs:

George W. Bramblett
Nina Cortell
Haynes and Boone, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, TX 75202-3789
Attorneys for West Orange-Cove ISD, et al

Mark R. Trachtenberg
Haynes and Boone, LLP
1221 McKinney, Suite 2100
Houston, TX 77010
Attorney for West Orange-Cove ISD, et al

J. David Thompson
Phillip Fraissinet
Bracewell & Giuliani, LLP
711 Louisiana St., Suite 2300
Houston, TX 77002-2770
Attorney for West Orange-Cove ISD, et al

Randall B. Wood
Doug W. Ray
Ray, Wood, Fine & Bonilla, LLP
2700 Bee Caves Road
Austin, TX 78746
Attorneys for Alvarado I.S.D., et al.

David G. Hinojosa
Nina Perales
M.A.L.D.E.F.
140 E. Houston St., Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205
Attorneys for Edgewood ISD, et al.

Appellants/Defendants are Shirley Neeley, In Her Official Capacity as Texas Commissioner of Education, Carole Keeton Strayhorn, In Her Official Capacity as Comptroller of Public Accounts, and the Texas State Board of Education.

Counsel for Appellants/Defendants: Greg Abbott, Attorney General

R. Ted. Cruz, Solicitor General
Amy Warr, Assistant Solicitor General
Danica L. Milios
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711-2548



Marc A. Levin

Attorney for *Amicus Curiae* Americans for Prosperity Texas

Potts & Reilly L.L.P.

401 W. 15th St., Suite 850

Austin, TX 78701

Telephone (512) 469-7474

Facsimile (512) 469-7480

School Districts	Students	Per Student Cost	Total Operating Expenditures	Total classroom expenditures	% in class	student/teacher	students/teaching staff	students/non-teaching staff	total teachers	total staff	total non-teaching staff	Teacher/Staff ratio	Rating
Abbeville	263	\$7,708	\$2,181,304	\$1,182,260	54.2	11.0	0.2	3.5	66.7	146.8	80.1	0.8	Unrecognized
Abbeville	770	\$7,262	\$5,609,888	\$3,206,807	56.8	11.1	3.2	9.0	66.9	149.0	100.0	0.9	Acceptable
Abbeville	17,035	\$6,812	\$112,859,430	\$65,639,012	58.5	13.2	0.7	11.0	1,200.5	2,642.5	1,442.0	1.0	Acceptable
Abbeville	626	\$8,300	\$5,200,079	\$3,110,387	62.1	12.5	7.0	10.2	70.0	153.0	83.0	1.3	Acceptable
Abbeville	133	\$8,602	\$1,156,706	\$673,268	58.7	9.6	5.0	14.7	13.8	22.0	8.1	1.5	Acceptable
Abbeville	327	\$7,402	\$2,470,874	\$1,209,101	48.2	10.1	0.4	17.0	32.4	61.1	28.7	1.7	Acceptable
Abbeville	4,350	\$7,204	\$31,380,200	\$17,619,388	56.3	14.1	0.8	13.5	300.0	631.3	332.4	1.0	Acceptable
Abbeville	794	\$8,040	\$6,200,200	\$3,032,008	49.3	12.2	7.0	7.5	64.3	200.0	135.7	0.9	Recognized
Abbeville	576	\$7,067	\$4,000,048	\$1,880,472	46.9	11.0	0.7	9.8	100.8	188.7	87.9	0.9	Recognized
Abbeville	64,202	\$8,889	\$563,158,180	\$309,011,233	54.6	15.0	7.3	13.7	3,480.3	7,437.3	3,957.0	0.8	Acceptable
Abbeville	3,483	\$8,387	\$22,217,715	\$10,820,027	48.7	14.7	0.7	21.3	237.8	401.7	164.0	1.5	Recognized
Abbeville	5,763	\$8,401	\$48,004,863	\$25,230,314	47.2	15.3	0.0	11.0	372.7	804.1	431.3	0.8	Acceptable
Abbeville	40,344	\$8,417	\$340,872,448	\$180,325,019	53.1	15.2	0.2	17.8	2,883.2	6,559.0	3,675.8	1.2	Acceptable
Abbeville	13,884	\$8,782	\$120,900,288	\$67,179,033	48.3	15.9	10.3	20.2	871.8	1,348.0	474.1	1.8	Acceptable
Abbeville	1,137	\$8,518	\$7,418,880	\$3,883,340	52.4	13.8	0.8	13.8	82.4	184.8	102.4	1.0	Recognized
Abbeville	849	\$8,048	\$4,600,472	\$2,633,771	47.5	10.7	5.9	13.2	94.4	110.8	32.4	1.2	Acceptable
Abbeville	3,437	\$8,078	\$28,883,623	\$15,073,701	48.3	15.9	7.4	13.8	218.2	484.5	246.3	0.8	Acceptable
Abbeville	12,131	\$8,110	\$74,120,410	\$40,008,142	44.1	18.4	9.8	27.0	787.7	1,237.0	450.1	1.8	Recognized
Abbeville	889	\$7,157	\$4,749,033	\$2,388,889	50.1	11.8	7.2	18.2	50.2	92.9	30.7	1.5	Recognized
Abbeville	20,827	\$8,810	\$171,817,813	\$90,702,610	53.7	14.6	8.1	18.2	2,022.4	3,840.3	1,822.9	1.2	Acceptable
Abbeville	189	\$7,000	\$1,403,022	\$814,101	58.0	10.9	0.0	1.7	122.0	240.7	118.1	1.0	Acceptable
Abbeville	1,437	\$8,719	\$9,853,203	\$4,731,049	48.0	14.8	7.0	13.2	88.4	205.3	108.8	0.8	Acceptable
Abbeville	522	\$7,670	\$4,180,340	\$1,813,758	40.0	12.7	0.2	12.1	41.1	84.2	43.1	1.0	Recognized
Abbeville	2,888	\$7,603	\$22,728,438	\$10,341,448	45.9	13.9	0.3	40.8	80.1	158.8	72.0	1.2	Acceptable
Abbeville	6,508	\$8,608	\$56,160,348	\$31,622,578	51.5	17.1	7.8	14.3	380.5	834.1	453.6	0.8	Recognized
Abbeville	1,000	\$7,000	\$7,830,000	\$3,979,230	52.1	12.4	7.7	10.9	87.4	201.0	104.2	0.9	Recognized
Abbeville	781	\$7,270	\$5,077,870	\$3,158,703	54.7	10.1	5.8	7.4	83.3	181.1	108.8	0.8	Recognized
Abbeville	752	\$7,301	\$5,558,032	\$2,709,800	49.3	13.3	6.4	12.3	68.5	117.5	51.0	0.9	Acceptable
Abbeville	357	\$8,037	\$2,889,209	\$1,382,899	48.2	10.1	9.2	18.1	35.3	57.0	22.2	1.8	Acceptable
Abbeville	230	\$8,103	\$1,884,380	\$1,108,021	58.8	9.0	4.8	10.0	24.0	48.0	23.0	1.0	Unrecognized
Abbeville	211	\$8,089	\$1,410,748	\$737,820	52.3	11.0	7.0	17.7	18.2	30.1	12.0	1.9	Recognized
Abbeville	3,343	\$8,810	\$22,785,830	\$10,586,111	46.5	14.2	0.7	12.7	235.4	499.0	263.6	0.8	Recognized
Abbeville	2,103	\$8,824	\$14,350,872	\$8,080,173	48.5	13.7	6.0	10.7	153.5	360.5	107.0	0.8	Acceptable
Abbeville	538	\$8,855	\$3,687,890	\$2,050,522	55.6	11.9	6.0	15.5	40.8	81.8	34.7	1.3	Recognized
Abbeville	1,280	\$8,321	\$8,508,580	\$4,152,138	48.3	14.0	8.2	24.9	83.2	147.8	64.7	1.7	Acceptable
Abbeville	82,484	\$8,908	\$708,853,324	\$370,025,032	54.5	19.0	8.2	189.8	3,971.1	7,288.9	3,317.8	1.2	Acceptable
Abbeville	806	\$8,842	\$8,130,432	\$4,875,173	40.0	12.4	6.9	5.7	135.4	283.1	167.7	0.9	Acceptable
Abbeville	230	\$8,528	\$2,248,844	\$1,277,343	56.8	9.0	4.8	10.0	27.4	49.2	21.7	1.3	Recognized
Abbeville	3,500	\$8,550	\$10,425,090	\$5,084,450	51.4	14.4	6.7	12.5	243.1	577.4	279.3	0.9	Recognized
Abbeville	1,047	\$8,030	\$11,740,410	\$6,234,158	53.1	12.8	6.4	12.8	152.1	304.2	152.1	1.0	Acceptable
Abbeville	1,142	\$8,284	\$7,153,488	\$3,190,458	44.6	14.4	7.5	9.9	190.0	392.2	193.2	1.0	Recognized
Abbeville	70,007	\$8,718	\$530,811,012	\$283,713,973	40.7	14.8	7.8	15.8	533.3	1,039.7	505.7	1.1	Acceptable
Abbeville	100	\$11,475	\$1,004,850	\$447,658	44.5	8.9	4.9	10.9	18.7	35.9	15.2	1.2	Acceptable
Abbeville	728	\$8,807	\$1,045,182	\$1,102,018	50.7	11.7	5.5	10.4	19.3	41.1	21.8	0.9	Acceptable
Abbeville	421	\$8,308	\$2,658,688	\$1,380,947	52.0	12.7	7.3	4.7	78.5	168.5	90.1	0.9	Acceptable
Abbeville	188	\$8,323	\$1,431,884	\$810,433	56.8	8.7	4.9	11.7	19.3	34.3	15.0	1.3	Acceptable
Abbeville	780	\$5,031	\$4,628,180	\$2,317,716	50.1	15.7	9.3	22.8	49.7	83.8	34.2	1.5	Recognized
Abbeville	5,882	\$8,135	\$35,088,070	\$18,704,748	52.0	15.0	7.4	14.0	392.1	784.9	407.7	1.0	Acceptable
Abbeville	378	\$7,388	\$2,753,482	\$1,573,797	50.5	11.1	5.7	11.7	34.1	60.3	32.3	1.1	Acceptable
Abbeville	1,032	\$7,270	\$7,502,640	\$3,823,881	52.3	12.1	5.4	10.9	27.3	139.9	62.1	1.2	Recognized
Abbeville	190	\$10,580	\$2,073,880	\$970,482	48.8	8.7	4.0	7.4	22.5	49.0	20.5	0.9	Recognized

Wagner Ind	2,087	\$0,264	\$18,006,000	\$7,018,000	47.4	13.4	0.8	10.0	70.3	152.3	21.0	1.1	Recognized
Wagner Ind	1,108	\$5,844	\$8,828,202	\$2,822,100	51.0	14.2	7.0	17.8	82.1	147.8	66.6	1.3	Acceptable
Warrington Ind	844	\$0,000	\$5,870,804	\$2,070,852	48.0	13.4	0.8	3.8	172.0	304.4	221.9	0.8	Acceptable
Warrington Ind	3,020	\$7,222	\$2,810,440	\$9,083,035	44.4	13.4	7.2	14.4	209.7	410.4	209.7	0.8	Acceptable
Warrington Ind	478	\$0,778	\$3,218,000	\$1,516,001	47.1	13.2	0.1	11.1	30.0	77.0	41.0	0.8	Acceptable
Warrington Ind	2,008	\$0,200	\$47,102,770	\$23,640,270	40.0	14.7	7.1	14.5	514.0	1000.3	521.7	1.0	Acceptable
Way City Ind	4,288	\$0,310	\$20,000,000	\$12,072,000	47.1	16.3	0.5	14.0	261.3	140.0	200.0	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	20,732	\$0,400	\$1,473,270	\$7,210,170	51.0	14.2	7.2	14.0	1400.0	200.4	1410.4	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	481	\$7,777	\$3,507,427	\$1,374,011	39.2	15.0	0.0	13.4	34.7	10.3	35.0	1.0	Recognized
Way City Ind	3,770	\$0,076	\$22,700,475	\$11,270,308	40.0	16.3	0.0	11.0	247.0	672.0	326.0	0.0	Acceptable
Way City Ind	102	\$7,201	\$1,004,112	\$801,014	57.0	11.0	0.0	11.3	10.1	33.1	17.0	1.0	Recognized
Way City Ind	770	\$0,010	\$5,309,144	\$2,074,800	39.4	11.0	0.1	12.0	60.0	127.2	60.3	1.1	Recognized
Way City Ind	2,141	\$0,000	\$13,034,400	\$0,000,440	49.7	13.0	7.4	63.0	84.1	83.1	30.0	1.4	Acceptable
Way City Ind	7,114	\$0,107	\$43,073,030	\$20,830,210	47.5	19.2	0.7	12.0	400.0	1001.0	403.0	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	017	\$7,002	\$4,013,830	\$2,240,000	40.7	12.3	0.0	10.3	40.2	110.2	60.0	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	485	\$0,000	\$3,000,450	\$1,010,230	41.8	12.8	0.3	0.2	38.0	01.5	62.7	0.7	Acceptable
Way City Ind	87	\$12,202	\$1,000,700	\$500,801	47.7	8.0	4.4	0.8	500.0	10.0	10.0	1.2	Recognized
Way City Ind	488	\$7,807	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	51.3	13.3	7.0	14.0	34.4	63.4	31.0	1.1	Recognized
Way City Ind	707	\$0,812	\$4,000,000	\$2,073,071	49.7	12.4	0.7	14.0	97.0	108.3	48.0	1.2	Acceptable
Way City Ind	5,811	\$0,838	\$22,840,170	\$11,772,028	51.3	14.4	7.0	13.0	273.0	481.0	288.0	0.0	Acceptable
Way City Ind	22,507	\$5,004	\$1,342,317,240	\$3,000,330	44.9	10.0	8.3	18.0	1355.8	2711.7	1355.8	1.0	Acceptable
Way City Ind	1,103	\$7,181	\$8,600,033	\$4,077,800	47.0	14.0	7.0	13.3	80.0	170.4	80.0	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	139	\$12,200	\$1,700,000	\$700,270	51.8	7.3	3.0	7.8	18.0	30.0	17.0	1.1	Recognized
Way City Ind	088	\$7,402	\$7,600,000	\$3,971,003	52.0	11.2	0.2	13.9	89.5	154.5	69.0	1.2	Acceptable
Way City Ind	570	\$0,030	\$3,700,000	\$1,890,407	48.1	13.0	7.0	15.2	44.5	82.7	34.2	1.2	Acceptable
Way City Ind	220	\$7,352	\$1,017,440	\$531,304	51.4	10.2	4.5	8.1	21.0	48.0	27.3	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	204	\$0,042	\$1,727,088	\$980,251	55.0	11.5	6.4	14.4	23.0	41.3	18.3	1.3	Acceptable
Way City Ind	017	\$0,498	\$9,000,032	\$3,157,121	53.0	14.5	7.5	15.5	63.2	122.3	59.0	1.1	Acceptable
Way City Ind	088	\$0,807	\$0,720,310	\$3,400,030	51.1	13.3	0.5	30.7	30.7	01.0	24.0	1.1	Acceptable
Way City Ind	077	\$7,821	\$3,204,817	\$2,303,245	43.5	10.7	5.7	12.2	63.3	118.8	55.8	1.1	Acceptable
Way City Ind	08	\$0,021	\$9,000,000	\$7,300,104	40.0	10.0	0.0	13.0	0.1	11.0	4.0	1.3	Recognized
Way City Ind	307	\$7,110	\$2,104,305	\$1,000,705	50.3	11.7	6.4	14.1	20.2	48.0	21.7	1.2	Acceptable
Way City Ind	0,380	\$0,082	\$32,721,180	\$18,753,234	51.2	14.0	7.4	15.7	384.3	727.0	342.7	1.1	Recognized
Way City Ind	018	\$7,270	\$3,743,000	\$1,850,002	49.0	12.3	0.0	23.0	23.1	45.1	22.0	1.1	Acceptable
Way City Ind	084	\$7,202	\$0,050,000	\$3,400,134	50.3	13.8	6.0	6.0	128.8	274.7	149.0	0.9	Acceptable
Way City Ind	2,000	\$0,040	\$12,192,441	\$9,080,373	50.1	14.1	6.2	11.1	142.5	324.0	181.5	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	373	\$7,274	\$2,713,202	\$1,508,540	56.0	10.3	6.0	14.4	36.2	62.2	26.0	1.4	Acceptable
Way City Ind	160	\$21,000	\$5,013,000	\$1,304,043	39.4	8.4	3.3	5.4	10.0	48.5	28.4	0.6	Recognized
Way City Ind	2,882	\$9,539	\$19,003,300	\$9,104,917	57.0	13.7	6.5	12.4	210.4	443.4	233.0	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	499	\$7,237	\$1,011,283	\$1,832,020	53.5	11.2	7.0	8.1	50.0	112.0	87.0	0.8	Recognized
Way City Ind	675	\$0,104	\$3,001,000	\$2,055,014	57.7	10.0	0.0	13.3	54.2	97.5	43.2	1.3	Acceptable
Way City Ind	1,851	\$0,101	\$10,072,701	\$5,147,170	51.1	13.0	7.2	15.3	171.4	220.3	107.0	1.1	Acceptable
Way City Ind	1,010	\$7,003	\$7,785,000	\$3,800,447	40.7	11.8	0.4	3.0	213.4	470.8	267.4	0.8	Recognized
Way City Ind	031	\$0,248	\$9,204,480	\$2,435,700	46.8	12.1	0.4	13.0	52.1	98.0	46.4	1.1	Recognized
Way City Ind	1,370	\$0,030	\$9,142,770	\$4,507,380	40.3	12.0	5.5	10.2	114.0	250.7	135.8	0.8	Acceptable
Way City Ind	850	\$7,843	\$9,737,137	\$3,757,885	55.7	11.8	8.1	12.0	72.8	140.8	80.0	1.1	Acceptable
Way City Ind	13,180	\$8,013	\$70,251,340	\$42,854,270	54.2	18.2	8.0	15.8	813.0	1947.5	833.9	1.0	Acceptable
Way City Ind	1,508	\$0,001	\$10,002,210	\$9,074,107	52.0	13.4	0.2	11.5	110.3	257.7	138.8	0.9	Acceptable
Way City Ind	482	\$11,873	\$5,400,320	\$2,240,044	41.0	11.7	5.8	11.5	30.5	70.7	40.7	1.0	Recognized
Way City Ind	4,837	\$0,208	\$30,410,030	\$15,450,040	50.8	13.8	7.2	15.1	350.5	671.8	321.3	1.1	Acceptable
Way City Ind	2,288	\$0,004	\$19,000,000	\$7,480,755	47.7	14.4	7.0	13.0	170.8	300.0	190.1	0.9	Recognized
Way City Ind	2,278	\$0,740	\$15,030,772	\$0,550,033	43.0	15.3	0.0	40.0	50.2	108.7	47.6	1.2	Acceptable
Way City Ind	492	\$0,700	\$9,020,400	\$1,344,010	44.4	12.8	0.7	14.1	38.3	97.5	32.2	1.1	Recognized
Way City Ind	704	\$6,740	\$4,751,260	\$7,423,181	51.0	11.0	0.8	3.1	145.0	371.3	225.7	0.6	Recognized

Upton, Inc.	514	\$10,630	\$5,488,446	\$2,167,378	40.0	10.6	5.7	12.3	48.5	80.2	41.7	1.7	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	293	\$9,010	\$2,552,377	\$1,378,266	64.0	10.4	3.5	11.7	27.2	31.8	24.2	1.1	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	105	\$7,202	\$1,416,080	\$804,846	41.3	11.1	6.1	12.0	14.7	31.0	10.3	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	1,048	\$7,202	\$12,017,218	\$8,702,288	48.2	12.8	0.0	21.8	88.1	144.5	75.4	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	1,047	\$6,637	\$12,727,638	\$8,603,772	51.1	12.8	6.0	21.8	152.1	324.5	172.4	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	2,721	\$8,400	\$14,032,848	\$7,932,163	48.0	15.5	7.1	13.1	176.5	387.2	207.7	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	4,873	\$9,181	\$17,359,083	\$9,181,083	48.0	15.2	6.7	12.0	307.1	604.2	387.0	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	5,688	\$6,242	\$22,405,058	\$11,065,058	52.0	15.2	6.8	13.2	272.7	545.3	272.7	1.0	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	014	\$3,073	\$5,458,322	\$2,506,037	47.0	11.1	2.2	2.7	82.3	411.5	333.1	0.3	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	14,213	\$0,118	\$88,020,708	\$42,420,234	48.8	19.2	0.0	12.8	836.1	2058.8	1124.8	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	274	\$0,030	\$1,004,300	\$502,150	50.0	12.8	6.5	11.2	21.4	42.2	20.7	1.2	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	210	\$8,087	\$1,817,070	\$958,282	62.8	9.8	5.1	11.0	22.1	41.2	10.1	1.2	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	103	\$16,084	\$1,663,082	\$1,000,808	50.0	6.7	2.8	5.8	16.1	35.5	17.4	1.0	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	774	\$0,475	\$5,011,050	\$2,230,243	45.0	13.0	0.4	12.1	58.0	120.0	64.0	0.8	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	1,084	\$5,400	\$8,639,440	\$3,020,262	42.5	14.0	6.3	10.2	107.1	188.4	61.3	1.3	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	1,080	\$0,380	\$10,137,020	\$5,129,727	50.0	12.7	5.8	10.6	126.1	233.8	108.8	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	424	\$0,483	\$3,401,877	\$1,109,380	51.0	13.0	6.8	14.7	276.4	524.5	248.1	1.1	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	2,720	\$3,805	\$3,607,000	\$1,768,121	48.7	11.5	5.1	8.2	30.8	83.1	40.3	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	3,083	\$0,787	\$20,624,321	\$9,708,886	48.4	14.5	0.0	18.5	443.8	830.7	382.8	1.1	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	3,083	\$0,787	\$20,624,321	\$9,708,886	48.4	14.5	0.0	18.5	273.8	500.0	323.2	0.8	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	602	\$0,418	\$3,347,270	\$1,070,885	50.1	10.8	5.1	9.8	30.0	78.1	38.5	0.8	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	108	\$10,288	\$1,111,212	\$530,057	48.7	7.4	4.3	10.3	14.6	25.1	10.5	1.4	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	233	\$1,189	\$1,988,037	\$940,882	48.3	10.8	5.5	11.4	22.0	42.4	20.4	1.1	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	1,170	\$9,652	\$7,782,840	\$3,774,877	48.8	13.3	0.8	13.8	88.0	172.1	84.1	1.0	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	3,024	\$0,078	\$23,248,700	\$11,438,852	48.2	18.7	7.3	13.8	248.9	637.8	287.8	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	4,888	\$0,273	\$11,078,187	\$5,748,075	48.0	13.8	5.8	10.3	137.3	323.0	186.2	0.7	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	1,104	\$8,334	\$7,213,938	\$3,087,263	50.7	13.5	9.3	11.8	81.8	179.2	93.8	0.8	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	274	\$8,424	\$2,582,178	\$1,443,438	48.0	11.1	4.3	7.0	24.7	63.7	38.0	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	1,039	\$0,378	\$10,453,542	\$5,184,088	49.4	12.9	6.2	11.0	58.1	107.8	61.8	1.1	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	323	\$7,304	\$2,358,182	\$1,059,277	44.9	11.2	6.0	12.8	28.8	83.8	25.0	1.2	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	323	\$7,304	\$2,358,182	\$1,059,277	44.9	11.2	6.0	12.8	28.8	83.8	25.0	1.2	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	1,788	\$5,834	\$10,489,532	\$5,387,703	50.8	9.4	6.2	11.8	72.0	131.2	68.8	1.2	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	4,830	\$8,487	\$1,380,510	\$1,874,382	47.4	13.7	6.8	13.5	352.8	710.3	357.7	1.0	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	2,721	\$5,188	\$40,841,100	\$19,219,731	48.0	18.0	7.8	18.2	482.8	880.8	507.3	1.0	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	878	\$5,918	\$3,453,688	\$1,771,748	51.3	14.8	8.0	17.3	38.7	72.0	33.3	1.2	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	2,485	\$8,950	\$17,285,880	\$8,400,831	48.8	14.4	6.3	41.0	63.5	124.1	60.7	1.0	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	7,304	\$7,088	\$91,770,782	\$21,277,778	41.1	14.3	7.5	15.8	510.8	973.9	483.1	1.1	Exemplary
Upton, Inc.	25,038	\$7,138	\$183,004,044	\$63,448,844	45.8	14.7	8.4	10.8	1744.1	3052.1	1308.1	1.3	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	2,812	\$8,789	\$19,789,988	\$10,852,341	55.4	14.8	6.5	11.7	189.5	448.0	248.5	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	3,233	\$8,042	\$19,633,788	\$9,024,800	46.2	18.5	7.3	13.1	105.8	447.0	248.8	0.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	841	\$7,088	\$3,840,018	\$2,082,080	53.7	11.0	6.1	13.7	48.2	88.7	38.5	1.2	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	7,584	\$8,872	\$4,037,888	\$2,049,977	47.8	10.9	6.4	16.7	447.8	900.5	487.8	1.0	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	513	\$7,281	\$3,738,153	\$2,081,804	55.2	12.4	7.4	18.4	41.4	89.3	28.0	1.5	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	1,317	\$8,584	\$8,881,328	\$4,282,407	49.8	14.2	7.5	15.9	82.4	174.0	82.5	1.1	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	2,470	\$5,535	\$13,071,450	\$6,835,725	50.0	13.8	7.1	14.8	170.0	347.9	188.8	1.1	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	642	\$7,189	\$3,001,858	\$1,763,148	45.7	13.8	7.1	14.8	30.3	78.3	37.1	1.1	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	187	\$8,219	\$1,372,573	\$702,757	51.2	11.1	5.8	11.3	15.0	28.8	14.8	1.0	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	882	\$8,078	\$5,473,732	\$3,317,082	60.8	8.8	5.8	15.4	77.5	121.8	44.3	1.8	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	760	\$8,145	\$4,870,200	\$2,809,535	62.3	12.8	7.8	16.9	119.0	217.0	93.0	1.3	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	1,382	\$5,254	\$7,313,588	\$4,044,403	55.3	14.2	8.1	16.9	98.0	171.0	73.8	1.3	Recognized
Upton, Inc.	7,451	\$9,988	\$4,407,588	\$2,523,343	52.0	10.8	8.5	17.2	443.5	870.0	433.1	1.0	Acceptable
Upton, Inc.	117	\$12,030	\$1,347,360	\$889,806	50.9	0.8	3.8	9.0	17.0	28.5	12.5	1.4	Recognized

Chapel Hill Ind (Smlb)	834	\$5,223	\$5,189,982	\$2,015,751	58.4	13.3	7.0	14.8	62.7	119.1	59.4	1.1	Acceptable
Chapel Hill Ind (Jlms)	3,047	\$5,420	\$16,614,740	\$7,870,019	48.3	13.2	7.6	17.0	230.8	400.0	170.1	1.4	Acceptable
Charlotte Ind	517	\$7,867	\$4,977,679	\$2,038,090	50.0	13.6	5.7	9.8	38.0	90.7	52.7	0.7	Acceptable
Cherokee Ind	130	\$10,982	\$1,083,372	\$395,604	62.1	7.0	4.2	9.4	19.2	34.8	18.0	1.2	Recognized
Chesler Ind	109	\$0,100	\$1,049,014	\$724,967	40.8	8.1	3.9	7.4	20.4	43.3	23.0	0.8	Acceptable
Chico Ind	889	\$9,089	\$4,013,421	\$2,740,605	67.1	12.4	8.0	11.3	190.0	161.4	90.0	1.0	Acceptable
Chickasaw Ind	1,151	\$7,990	\$6,100,600	\$4,430,361	64.4	11.0	6.3	9.0	90.7	217.2	120.4	0.6	Recognized
Chillicothe Ind	217	\$0,642	\$1,053,014	\$821,240	40.7	10.0	6.2	10.2	20.6	41.7	21.3	1.0	Recognized
Chillicothe Ind	401	\$0,144	\$2,744,644	\$1,479,239	62.6	11.8	6.4	10.0	34.0	74.3	40.3	0.8	Acceptable
China Spring Ind	1,000	\$5,000	\$10,202,400	\$5,414,474	61.1	15.6	8.8	25.8	113.0	183.7	88.7	1.0	Recognized
Chillicothe Ind	300	\$7,000	\$3,170,000	\$1,492,010	61.3	9.0	8.0	14.0	30.3	51.7	21.4	1.4	Recognized
Chillicothe Ind	692	\$0,232	\$6,480,944	\$2,645,900	43.0	12.0	7.7	18.1	69.1	110.0	40.7	1.0	Recognized
Chillicothe Ind	359	\$0,041	\$2,000,000	\$1,388,788	47.0	12.0	6.8	10.7	28.2	61.2	35.0	0.8	Recognized
Cinco Ind	646	\$0,873	\$8,014,688	\$3,221,205	65.4	10.0	6.0	11.0	79.0	181.1	71.3	1.1	Recognized
City View Ind	1,002	\$0,183	\$0,000,000	\$3,092,333	49.7	14.0	7.7	4.0	20.3	420.1	218.0	0.0	Acceptable
Clarendon Ind	631	\$7,824	\$4,267,824	\$2,187,875	62.0	9.0	9.0	12.0	43.0	84.8	41.2	1.3	Acceptable
Clarksville Ind	880	\$7,883	\$2,000,107	\$1,011,613	48.0	8.7	4.3	7.7	103.0	232.3	129.3	0.8	Acceptable
Clarks Ind	374	\$7,882	\$2,000,000	\$1,712,000	88.3	9.0	5.0	13.4	39.0	88.8	27.8	1.4	Recognized
Clarks Creek Ind	32,410	\$5,776	\$189,000,000	\$97,830,239	61.0	17.0	0.1	10.0	1930.0	3005.9	1075.5	1.2	Recognized
Clarksburg Ind	0,413	\$5,772	\$27,015,838	\$10,692,425	63.2	14.2	7.0	10.4	421.0	811.0	389.0	1.1	Acceptable
Clarksburg Ind	3,320	\$9,181	\$20,870,849	\$9,876,744	48.0	10.3	7.0	13.0	204.2	443.0	239.0	0.8	Acceptable
Clarksburg Ind	1,108	\$0,606	\$7,050,240	\$4,140,682	64.3	13.9	0.0	12.0	84.0	177.0	82.0	0.8	Acceptable
Clarksburg Ind	0,884	\$5,870	\$9,178,484	\$23,000,343	48.7	17.3	8.0	17.1	495.0	985.8	500.8	1.0	Acceptable
Clyde Conn Ind	1,463	\$9,654	\$8,034,422	\$3,483,801	63.2	11.8	0.7	10.0	126.0	222.0	90.3	1.3	Acceptable
Columbia Ind	704	\$7,842	\$5,085,749	\$3,401,882	58.8	13.0	0.4	12.0	61.1	124.1	63.0	1.0	Acceptable
Collegiate-Orchard Conn	1,784	\$0,680	\$1,002,382	\$3,200,029	48.2	12.3	0.9	13.8	143.0	278.0	130.1	1.1	Acceptable
Collegiate Ind	1,038	\$0,404	\$8,070,832	\$2,883,959	43.2	10.7	5.7	12.2	88.1	180.4	84.3	1.1	Acceptable
Collegiate Ind	7,031	\$9,400	\$59,805,880	\$23,421,880	40.1	18.0	8.0	10.0	405.7	891.4	489.7	1.0	Recognized
Collegiate Ind	585	\$0,548	\$3,889,870	\$1,680,789	63.0	11.5	0.0	15.5	44.0	89.0	30.5	1.3	Recognized
Collegiate Ind	602	\$0,719	\$5,044,838	\$2,018,374	48.8	13.4	5.7	8.9	44.0	108.0	60.7	0.7	Recognized
Collegiate Ind	1,078	\$7,847	\$3,811,118	\$3,811,118	48.8	10.3	6.3	10.7	97.0	194.0	99.1	1.0	Acceptable
Columbia-Bruceton Ind	3,123	\$0,015	\$18,284,845	\$8,183,789	48.8	14.8	7.0	13.2	209.0	440.1	238.5	0.9	Acceptable
Columbia Ind	1,885	\$0,207	\$9,407,855	\$3,413,030	55.2	13.4	7.0	14.7	118.0	223.9	108.8	1.1	Acceptable
Connell Ind	11,089	\$0,311	\$75,002,670	\$24,880,440	48.1	15.8	7.5	4.0	607.7	3252.0	2585.2	0.3	Acceptable
Connell Ind	1,407	\$9,809	\$7,839,583	\$4,709,185	80.1	13.5	7.2	2.7	377.1	880.8	622.7	0.7	Acceptable
Connell Ind	1,211	\$9,882	\$7,040,582	\$3,809,718	40.2	12.8	9.7	14.1	94.6	180.7	89.1	1.1	Acceptable
Connell Ind	1,878	\$9,128	\$11,208,112	\$4,808,280	42.8	15.0	8.8	12.4	121.9	280.0	147.0	0.8	Acceptable
Connell Ind	1,478	\$9,874	\$9,810,072	\$4,711,719	48.0	13.0	8.8	14.3	109.8	210.0	100.2	1.1	Acceptable
Connell Ind	800	\$9,746	\$4,500,800	\$2,514,450	54.7	13.5	8.2	20.0	50.3	97.8	38.3	1.5	Acceptable
Connell Ind	177	\$9,078	\$1,880,250	\$881,090	43.1	10.8	9.0	13.8	16.7	20.5	12.8	1.3	Acceptable
Connell Ind	2,034	\$9,798	\$17,050,884	\$8,449,113	47.2	15.0	7.1	12.8	195.7	371.0	205.3	0.8	Acceptable
Connell Ind	30,240	\$9,002	\$239,089,932	\$110,543,318	50.0	16.2	8.1	16.2	2422.8	4845.2	2422.0	1.0	Acceptable
Connell Ind	270	\$7,945	\$2,145,190	\$851,625	39.7	11.3	5.0	17.3	23.9	45.8	21.0	1.1	Acceptable
Copier Ind	938	\$6,002	\$5,017,872	\$2,690,081	47.0	12.2	8.1	12.2	76.7	153.4	76.7	1.0	Acceptable
Copier Ind	10,000	\$0,207	\$92,088,801	\$28,774,180	45.0	15.1	8.7	20.5	682.5	1149.8	487.3	1.4	Recognized
Copier Ind	7,486	\$0,018	\$51,049,788	\$26,590,841	51.5	14.0	6.2	11.1	533.3	1704.2	670.0	0.8	Recognized
Corpus Christi Ind	30,310	\$9,177	\$242,817,870	\$127,238,584	52.4	18.3	7.8	15.0	2411.7	5038.7	2028.1	0.9	Acceptable
Corpus Christi Ind	1,178	\$7,631	\$8,502,478	\$4,191,888	49.3	12.1	9.1	97.5	22.3	41.9	19.0	1.1	Acceptable
Corpus Christi Ind	5,480	\$5,520	\$30,249,800	\$18,123,037	53.3	14.8	7.3	14.4	370.3	760.7	380.4	1.0	Acceptable
Corpus Christi Ind	134	\$10,324	\$1,383,418	\$709,692	51.3	8.4	4.4	9.7	10.0	30.5	14.5	1.1	Recognized
Cowlin Ind	1,268	\$7,131	\$9,042,108	\$4,593,301	50.8	11.8	5.0	10.7	197.3	276.4	119.0	0.9	Acceptable
Cowlin Ind	135	\$7,004	\$945,840	\$577,725	61.1	10.4	6.8	2.1	78.3	141.5	63.1	1.2	Acceptable
Cowlin Ind	340	\$7,098	\$2,442,008	\$1,352,908	55.4	12.4	5.7	23.8	11.4	24.8	13.4	0.9	Acceptable
Cowlin Ind	2,078	\$6,480	\$13,471,820	\$8,400,422	48.0	15.7	7.0	15.0	132.4	263.2	130.7	1.0	Recognized

Granada, Inc.	1,000	\$10,561	\$10,045,488	\$5,025,310	47.3	10.0	5.7	1.1	100.0	176.0	76.0	1.3	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	107	\$0,760	\$1,044,002	\$505,028	57.0	7.2	3.8	8.0	14.9	28.2	13.3	1.1	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	840	\$0,767	\$4,321,200	\$1,063,488	46.0	12.6	7.0	15.8	51.2	91.4	40.2	1.3	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	826	\$10,234	\$1,443,080	\$4,728,108	54.3	10.2	6.1	10.2	100.0	101.0	100.0	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,000	\$0,303	\$1,044,017	\$4,700,000	54.3	12.1	6.0	8.6	130.0	517.0	100.2	0.7	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	4,218	\$0,200	\$2,017,000	\$1,170,000	46.1	10.0	7.0	16.1	207.4	570.6	300.0	0.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	400	\$0,313	\$1,060,046	\$1,075,014	40.0	8.3	6.1	11.3	50.0	91.2	41.2	1.2	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	400	\$0,500	\$2,020,000	\$1,475,002	50.2	11.4	6.2	13.0	38.1	84.6	20.4	1.2	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	024	\$0,100	\$1,000,000	\$1,511,000	50.0	12.7	6.0	16.1	40.1	90.4	41.3	1.2	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	200	\$0,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,300,074	48.3	10.8	4.7	6.3	21.7	63.8	35.0	0.6	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	11,810	\$0,000	\$40,230,702	\$30,210,100	50.2	18.0	0.1	21.6	707.0	1200.0	641.2	1.4	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	2,071	\$0,070	\$13,023,018	\$0,603,660	48.4	16.0	6.0	43.7	42.3	80.7	47.4	0.6	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,000	\$0,000	\$12,010,000	\$7,000,000	54.4	13.7	6.4	10.3	40.1	70.0	30.0	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	005	\$0,113	\$9,400,778	\$2,001,000	40.2	11.0	5.3	8.8	87.8	120.0	07.0	0.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	002	\$0,007	\$2,000,000	\$1,044,003	50.4	10.4	6.2	4.0	74.3	132.0	71.7	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	025	\$0,100	\$1,000,000	\$1,700,011	54.7	11.8	6.8	10.0	40.7	77.2	31.0	1.4	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	74,877	\$0,000	\$444,303,030	\$230,630,000	52.5	16.0	8.7	19.8	480.8	800.0	375.8	1.3	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,400	\$0,710	\$10,021,000	\$4,070,000	47.3	11.7	6.0	12.3	133.8	201.0	127.2	1.1	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,025	\$0,204	\$10,102,750	\$5,457,397	53.7	12.0	6.3	12.4	127.0	207.0	131.0	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	100,000	\$0,730	\$1,000,000,000	\$500,000,000	52.4	10.0	8.2	12.3	1020.0	1950.0	020.0	1.1	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	100	\$7,200	\$1,210,321	\$0,333,927	52.0	12.8	9.7	14.1	13.2	20.2	12.0	1.1	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	742	\$7,188	\$1,333,000	\$2,762,084	51.0	13.8	7.7	17.4	63.8	90.4	42.0	1.3	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	71	\$10,273	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	45.1	7.7	4.3	9.7	9.2	10.5	7.3	1.3	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	100	\$11,314	\$1,010,200	\$745,819	41.2	8.1	4.7	0.7	17.0	34.0	16.9	1.1	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	470	\$0,700	\$3,231,000	\$1,012,313	40.0	14.2	6.1	10.7	33.5	70.0	44.5	0.6	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	5,110	\$3,778	\$20,000,000	\$10,181,000	48.0	18.7	8.8	18.0	308.3	981.4	278.0	1.1	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	634	\$0,193	\$4,000,222	\$2,223,472	54.0	13.0	5.4	8.3	50.7	121.1	70.4	0.7	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	2,840	\$0,702	\$10,204,000	\$0,000,000	50.4	13.0	8.3	21.3	200.3	342.0	133.0	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	11,810	\$0,412	\$75,763,428	\$30,830,740	48.0	10.2	7.5	14.0	720.0	1975.0	846.3	0.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	940	\$7,000	\$6,000,000	\$3,000,000	54.2	12.1	6.7	13.9	13.0	19.0	0.0	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	7,000	\$0,500	\$50,000,000	\$20,000,000	48.0	14.8	7.9	70.2	127.4	239.4	100.0	1.2	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	130	\$1,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	44.0	7.7	3.1	6.2	17.0	44.5	28.0	0.7	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	4,001	\$0,441	\$20,000,000	\$10,000,000	48.0	14.8	7.7	0.7	241.2	860.0	074.3	0.4	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	10,001	\$0,300	\$101,448,300	\$40,402,310	47.0	13.0	8.3	20.0	1147.0	1921.0	774.3	1.5	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,204	\$0,000	\$10,407,100	\$4,170,300	39.0	14.0	6.3	11.5	02.4	203.4	113.0	0.8	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	7,051	\$0,300	\$40,874,000	\$20,241,700	49.0	15.1	9.1	22.0	608.7	840.0	334.1	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	543	\$7,100	\$3,000,000	\$2,130,000	55	11.1	4.8	8.5	48.0	113.1	84.2	0.8	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	100	\$13,177	\$2,213,730	\$721,078	32.0	11.2	9.0	12.0	15.0	28.0	13.0	1.2	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,000	\$0,703	\$1,410,740	\$0,002,040	52.0	13.7	6.8	13.6	144.0	201.2	146.7	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	125	\$11,400	\$1,437,375	\$550,827	38.0	10.0	7.4	13.8	7.8	16.0	0.1	0.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	704	\$0,000	\$5,476,502	\$3,073,490	56.1	12.4	6.4	7.7	83.7	185.0	101.3	0.8	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	324	\$0,303	\$2,700,012	\$1,300,160	51.0	12.0	6.0	14.7	27.0	40.1	22.1	1.2	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,032	\$0,000	\$10,027,302	\$5,002,100	48.0	13.3	9.4	17.3	145.3	301.0	198.0	0.9	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	0,530	\$0,238	\$40,700,202	\$10,407,755	47.0	16.0	9.0	20.7	411.3	720.0	316.3	1.3	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	848	\$0,300	\$7,122,000	\$3,730,235	52.5	17.0	6.2	0.2	70.7	103.1	87.4	0.8	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	210	\$0,000	\$2,100,430	\$1,153,130	54.0	7.8	6.2	17.0	20.1	41.0	12.0	2.3	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	1,155	\$7,522	\$9,087,010	\$4,720,223	54.4	11.3	5.7	11.5	102.2	202.0	100.4	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	10	\$20,010	\$377,040	\$140,324	58.7	9.4	2.5	4.7	3.0	8.4	3.4	0.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	280	\$0,800	\$1,007,801	\$1,027,192	52.2	10.5	7.2	5.2	54.4	110.3	95.0	1.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	11,700	\$0,000	\$7,375,300	\$3,000,000	47.4	14.7	6.7	337.5	0.0	11.0	3.5	2.4	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	31	\$10,004	\$328,724	\$178,820	54.4	10.0	3.5	8.7	8.0	8.0	6.0	0.5	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	350	\$0,302	\$2,204,072	\$1,273,123	50.3	12.2	8.1	24.1	20.2	44.0	14.8	2.0	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	3,200	\$0,387	\$20,040,300	\$9,280,017	44.2	19.3	7.0	100.0	30.2	93.7	20.3	1.7	Acceptable
Granville, Inc.	205	\$10,327	\$3,103,405	\$885,038	28.5	11.8	5.7	11.0	25.0	51.8	20.8	0.0	Acceptable

Dublin Ind	1,338	\$5,672	\$7,059,735	\$4,039,508	51.3	13.7	0.0	12.7	97.7	202.7	105.1	0.8	Acceptable
Durham Ind	4,195	\$5,209	\$22,099,780	\$11,619,814	52.2	13.4	7.4	18.5	311.1	598.9	263.8	1.2	Acceptable
Durhamville Ind	11,368	\$0,131	\$60,602,408	\$31,021,321	45.8	16.4	8.8	18.9	603.2	1,791.8	508.0	1.2	Acceptable
Easton Ind	8,817	\$5,194	\$41,899,014	\$21,458,440	44.9	16.8	11.0	38.6	387.0	740.0	231.0	2.2	Acceptable
Easton Park Ind	15,400	\$5,654	\$78,005,844	\$40,780,861	51.0	17.0	7.0	15.7	793.9	1,715.8	881.0	0.6	Acceptable
Easton Ind	7,011	\$7,100	\$50,771,860	\$21,790,089	42.9	14.9	7.1	15.0	415.0	906.7	322.0	0.9	Recognized
Easton Ind	1,288	\$0,480	\$0,704,709	\$3,105,077	49.9	11.7	9.9	1.1	64.0	213.0	119.7	0.8	Recognized
Easton Ind	889	\$0,651	\$5,702,036	\$3,225,263	65.7	12.8	6.7	14.1	98.1	139.1	62.0	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	7,917	\$0,333	\$5,130,391	\$3,009,027	49.0	15.8	0.0	0.0	97.7	160.0	67.8	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,180	\$0,000	\$0,358,444	\$4,087,478	49.0	15.2	7.0	75.8	65.0	71.0	10.2	3.4	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,180	\$0,000	\$7,048,244	\$4,214,238	59.1	12.0	7.0	15.3	92.1	109.7	77.0	1.2	Acceptable
Easton Ind	20,000	\$0,032	\$182,150,000	\$90,705,393	53.1	15.8	7.0	16.1	108.2	3,302.5	1,010.3	1.0	Acceptable
Easton Ind	200	\$7,220	\$1,890,024	\$3,341,600	49.0	11.2	0.0	10.0	22.0	37.1	14.2	1.0	Recognized
Easton Ind	8,889	\$5,840	\$20,780,000	\$14,228,202	47.8	10.9	6.4	10.4	323.3	838.4	919.2	0.6	Acceptable
Easton Ind	313	\$2,840	\$2,487,000	\$1,104,833	47.8	11.2	5.0	11.2	27.9	55.0	27.0	1.0	Recognized
Easton Ind	934	\$0,052	\$0,300,700	\$3,020,000	47.2	10.1	0.0	10.0	48.0	137.4	89.0	0.8	Acceptable
Easton Ind	12,894	\$0,884	\$78,097,230	\$30,554,971	48.1	12.0	0.2	11.0	899.0	2,079.7	1,000.1	0.9	Recognized
Easton Ind	25,373	\$0,311	\$160,120,003	\$70,891,821	48.0	38.0	7.8	30.6	769.5	1,508.5	830.0	0.8	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,899	\$9,735	\$8,017,828	\$4,717,582	52.0	14.1	6.4	11.7	110.3	243.0	132.7	0.8	Acceptable
Easton Ind	3,480	\$0,268	\$21,080,244	\$12,334,339	50.1	14.0	7.0	14.0	240.7	488.4	248.7	1.0	Acceptable
Easton Ind	92,280	\$0,443	\$407,107,000	\$211,339,854	51.9	20.2	7.3	22.7	314.9	692.3	277.8	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	023	\$7,164	\$4,480,042	\$2,103,077	47.2	12.2	6.1	12.2	51.1	102.1	51.1	1.0	Acceptable
Easton Ind	3,804	\$0,000	\$20,050,404	\$10,452,387	51.1	10.0	7.4	14.9	205.0	416.8	211.2	1.0	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,228	\$5,812	\$7,110,700	\$3,050,020	51.4	13.2	7.4	10.8	92.8	189.9	72.7	1.3	Acceptable
Easton Ind	891	\$0,510	\$6,261,070	\$3,360,308	53.0	12.5	0.0	15.4	76.8	139.3	62.4	1.2	Recognized
Easton Ind	6,093	\$0,880	\$39,324,150	\$18,333,234	51.0	18.1	7.5	111.5	85.1	113.4	48.3	1.3	Acceptable
Easton Ind	382	\$6,447	\$2,462,754	\$1,350,077	55.1	11.1	7.7	4.8	113.0	197.0	84.0	1.3	Recognized
Easton Ind	149	\$0,808	\$988,082	\$404,392	41.7	13.0	7.5	10.9	11.0	10.9	8.8	1.3	Recognized
Easton Ind	899	\$7,387	\$3,782,890	\$1,870,288	50.0	10.3	9.4	11.4	48.3	94.1	44.8	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,613	\$0,078	\$9,040,175	\$4,882,811	51.8	14.4	6.8	13.2	103.1	219.3	114.2	0.8	Recognized
Easton Ind	449	\$10,488	\$4,700,132	\$2,131,702	47.1	10.8	8.7	12.1	41.8	78.8	37.2	1.1	Recognized
Easton Ind	392	\$0,438	\$1,043,370	\$3,321,818	48.0	12.2	5.7	10.7	24.8	53.0	28.2	0.9	Acceptable
Easton Ind	3,632	\$0,280	\$24,088,448	\$12,089,603	53.8	15.3	8.0	18.8	280.9	479.0	228.5	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	88	\$0,192	\$825,050	\$330,280	53.8	8.8	4.4	8.8	7.7	16.9	7.7	1.0	Recognized
Easton Ind	82	\$7,231	\$833,042	\$288,444	45.5	11.7	4.7	7.8	7.0	17.4	10.4	0.7	Acceptable
Easton Ind	2,774	\$0,512	\$18,084,288	\$9,208,880	51.3	15.5	7.1	13.1	179.0	390.7	211.7	0.8	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,077	\$0,688	\$11,165,486	\$4,870,309	43.7	14.4	6.7	42.1	54.8	94.7	39.0	1.4	Acceptable
Easton Ind	332	\$0,841	\$2,304,412	\$1,168,032	50.6	12.3	6.4	13.3	27.0	51.9	24.0	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	220	\$0,262	\$2,033,240	\$888,659	44.1	8.7	3.8	6.7	25.3	57.0	32.0	0.8	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,498	\$5,880	\$8,687,800	\$4,883,748	57.8	13.9	7.8	18.3	105.0	183.8	80.2	1.3	Recognized
Easton Ind	481	\$0,685	\$3,201,055	\$1,750,977	54.7	12.0	9.1	7.2	142.3	380.9	218.7	0.7	Acceptable
Easton Ind	212	\$0,218	\$1,747,216	\$870,810	50.5	10.3	5.3	10.9	20.6	40.0	19.4	1.1	Recognized
Easton Ind	2,277	\$9,888	\$13,338,008	\$7,459,314	55.9	13.7	7.0	14.3	168.2	325.3	159.1	1.0	Acceptable
Easton Ind	589	\$7,043	\$3,080,338	\$1,895,188	49.8	12.3	6.5	13.8	40.0	87.1	41.1	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	1,048	\$0,084	\$7,208,272	\$3,308,117	45.3	13.1	7.3	16.5	80.0	143.8	63.0	1.3	Recognized
Easton Ind	3,668	\$0,160	\$21,030,000	\$11,182,828	50.9	14.3	7.0	29.4	179.0	288.0	121.4	1.5	Acceptable
Easton Ind	5,006	\$0,188	\$31,247,088	\$16,748,430	53.6	18.1	0.0	12.1	314.7	734.2	418.5	0.8	Recognized
Easton Ind	1,053	\$7,384	\$7,754,282	\$3,915,917	50.5	11.1	5.9	10.9	94.9	191.5	98.0	1.0	Recognized
Easton Ind	155	\$0,754	\$1,511,870	\$808,650	53.5	8.7	5.0	11.8	17.8	31.0	13.2	1.4	Recognized
Easton Ind	150	\$0,087	\$1,303,050	\$710,148	52.1	9.7	5.8	14.4	15.5	25.0	10.4	1.5	Recognized
Easton Ind	685	\$0,738	\$24,839,040	\$11,823,383	47.6	15.5	11.2	40.4	249.5	330.7	94.2	2.0	Recognized
Easton Ind	893	\$0,730	\$4,481,435	\$2,115,237	47.2	14.2	7.5	19.1	49.3	84.1	34.7	1.4	Acceptable
Easton Ind	81,248	\$0,113	\$374,400,024	\$198,838,147	52.6	18.0	8.7	17.0	3824.1	7040.0	3415.0	1.1	Acceptable
Easton Ind	155	\$14,318	\$2,210,290	\$872,181	30.3	7.9	4.7	11.0	10.6	31.0	13.4	1.5	Recognized

Fort Worth Ind	89,135	\$0.420	\$515,180,700	\$250,054,840	48.6	21.0	8.0	12.8	3825.5	10041.9	8710.4	0.8	Acceptable
Franklin Ind	1052	\$0.808	\$0,840,210	\$3,020,112	154.4	12.3	0.8	14.2	74.2	145.8	97.5	1.2	Acceptable
Franklin Ind	710	\$0.570	\$5,100,300	\$2,002,024	51.3	11.1	0.3	14.2	69.0	125.4	55.5	1.3	Acceptable
Frederick Ind	2,640	\$0.801	\$10,374,044	\$0,000,000	40.7	13.7	7.0	14.3	202.8	400.0	100.0	1.0	Acceptable
Frost Ind	1110	\$7.000	\$0,000,144	\$0,001,276	150.0	12.0	0.5	17.5	71.4	120.0	52.0	1.4	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	6,600	\$0.070	\$13,170,100	\$16,620,407	47.7	14.0	0.5	18.2	300.5	570.6	210.0	1.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	5,627	\$0.802	\$12,600,014	\$17,410,127	154.0	17.1	0.7	17.7	323.2	605.1	317.1	1.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,272	\$0.330	\$4,001,050	\$4,000,000	60.2	12.1	0.1	17.7	105.1	200.5	103.4	1.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	13,411	\$0.874	\$02,107,214	\$07,700,700	41.0	14.4	0.2	20.0	031.3	145.7	67.4	1.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	418	\$7.100	\$2,003,035	\$1,600,121	61.0	11.2	0.4	4.1	114.5	215.1	100.8	1.1	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	440	\$0.200	\$2,020,000	\$1,170,652	41.0	12.7	0.7	14.2	30.3	60.0	31.0	1.1	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	305	\$11.453	\$4,000,214	\$1,000,022	40.3	8.0	0.0	11.0	41.3	71.0	29.7	1.4	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	607	\$7.000	\$4,510,722	\$2,240,328	40.6	12.7	7.1	10.1	44.0	76.0	35.2	1.3	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	2,201	\$7.120	\$10,002,030	\$7,300,040	45.3	14.1	0.9	10.1	102.8	346.3	224.8	0.7	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	2,003	\$0.278	\$10,700,030	\$0,001,710	51.1	13.7	0.0	12.7	226.5	408.0	210.1	1.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	20,404	\$0.400	\$1,400,302,320	\$0,121,000	60.7	13.7	0.0	10.2	1403.0	2500.0	1003.8	1.4	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	0,170	\$0.200	\$07,000,000	\$2,000,120	40.8	10.2	0.8	12.3	003.3	140.8	74.2	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	0,34	\$7.032	\$4,400,200	\$2,400,433	60.3	13.0	0.2	13.3	94.7	102.3	47.0	1.1	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	03,114	\$0.504	\$008,307,710	\$10,801,601	62.0	10.0	0.2	22.4	3932.0	5000.7	2497.7	1.4	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	174	\$0.110	\$1,412,010	\$782,469	54.0	11.0	7.1	18.3	15.0	24.0	9.5	1.2	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	000	\$0.700	\$4,210,020	\$2,000,700	49.0	11.0	0.5	14.6	59.0	107.1	48.1	1.2	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	207	\$0.877	\$2,042,000	\$370,173	47.5	11.0	0.7	10.0	29.0	62.1	27.1	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	2,010	\$0.700	\$15,001,240	\$7,457,320	52.1	14.2	7.0	14.3	105.8	378.3	182.6	1.1	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	104	\$7.420	\$1,210,350	\$009,317	48.4	11.1	7.3	21.3	14.8	22.0	7.7	1.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,147	\$7.021	\$0,003,087	\$4,270,189	53.1	14.4	7.0	13.0	76.7	103.0	84.2	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	8,002	\$0.003	\$02,411,000	\$23,001,232	40.0	12.8	0.0	18.0	670.7	1268.4	678.6	1.2	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	142	\$7.000	\$1,000,100	\$045,000	54.5	13.5	0.2	11.0	10.5	22.0	12.4	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,070	\$0.140	\$11,200,500	\$5,050,770	50.0	13.2	0.0	11.0	138.3	304.2	180.0	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	2,210	\$0.244	\$14,211,344	\$7,001,507	50.0	13.3	0.3	8.2	247.8	520.3	278.0	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	2,209	\$0.308	\$14,410,728	\$7,000,170	53.3	14.4	0.0	13.2	157.3	328.3	171.0	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	207	\$11.304	\$1,201,000	\$1,000,170	51.7	11.2	5.0	12.5	25.0	48.0	23.0	1.1	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,000	\$0.505	\$10,001,000	\$0,200,000	46.0	11.0	0.0	10.0	134.1	285.0	150.0	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,340	\$0.700	\$0,100,320	\$4,000,310	50.0	13.2	7.1	15.4	101.0	188.7	87.2	1.2	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	102	\$12.300	\$1,203,700	\$001,300	40.0	0.1	4.4	8.5	11.2	23.2	12.0	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	004	\$0.010	\$0,000,240	\$2,317,001	50.5	10.0	0.0	10.0	87.0	98.2	33.0	1.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,340	\$7.201	\$0,700,350	\$5,003,031	51.0	11.8	5.4	10.0	113.4	247.8	134.4	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	2,027	\$0.101	\$10,237,407	\$0,200,881	50.0	14.0	0.2	11.1	187.0	423.7	230.1	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	300	\$0.000	\$2,145,220	\$1,005,401	50.0	14.4	5.5	8.0	21.4	56.0	34.0	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	10,247	\$0.540	\$120,071,015	\$00,070,202	48.4	15.0	8.3	17.4	1210.5	2310.0	1108.4	1.1	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	100	\$0.000	\$1,000,100	\$007,013	52.5	12.1	5.0	11.1	15.4	32.1	16.7	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	301	\$7.000	\$3,002,000	\$1,507,503	52.2	10.3	4.4	8.0	38.0	80.0	48.0	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	200	\$7.000	\$1,007,701	\$002,507	40.1	13.7	0.0	13.0	18.0	37.5	18.0	1.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	307	\$7.050	\$2,020,033	\$1,501,370	51.4	10.0	5.0	12.5	34.0	20.3	20.3	1.2	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	2,421	\$5.040	\$14,402,020	\$0,001,800	55.0	14.0	8.0	0.4	233.3	400.0	267.0	0.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	0,000	\$0.102	\$40,010,544	\$10,300,814	44.0	14.4	7.4	277.0	30.8	84.0	23.0	1.3	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	22,132	\$0.010	\$13,013,320	\$00,235,833	51.3	15.8	6.5	18.4	1400.8	2003.8	1203.0	1.2	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,201	\$5.104	\$0,537,024	\$3,412,327	52.2	14.3	8.4	20.4	60.2	150.1	01.0	1.4	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	100	\$13.200	\$1,447,020	\$700,000	48.4	5.0	3.1	6.0	10.5	35.2	15.7	1.2	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,100	\$0.321	\$7,320,030	\$4,283,733	58.5	12.0	5.7	10.4	92.0	203.3	111.3	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	33	\$12.010	\$413,127	\$00,040	71.7	14.0	0.3	6.5	2.4	6.2	3.0	0.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	402	\$0.407	\$2,000,004	\$1,400,571	40.0	11.2	7.2	20.2	41.3	04.2	22.0	1.8	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	1,224	\$0.000	\$7,200,040	\$3,122,277	42.0	13.5	0.0	12.0	90.7	183.0	94.8	1.0	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	00.1	\$0.503	\$3,021,300	\$2,030,081	52.0	12.1	0.3	13.1	49.8	94.7	45.0	1.1	Acceptable
Frontier Ind	13,777	\$0.600	\$01,000,712	\$41,350,570	45.1	15.7	8.4	18.1	877.5	1040.1	707.0	1.2	Acceptable

Greenville, Inc.	5,208	\$5,778	\$30,643,488	\$15,424,481	58.5	13.7	7.2	15.2	380.0	144.4	148.5	1.1	Acceptable
Greenwood, Inc.	1,603	\$5,018	\$9,004,754	\$4,072,187	55.0	18.1	8.8	19.4	93.4	17.0	77.4	1.2	Acceptable
Greenville Portland, Inc.	4,302	\$5,548	\$23,871,708	\$11,070,514	46.4	18.3	8.7	18.7	203.0	484.5	230.8	1.1	Recognized
Greenback, Inc.	1,088	\$7,231	\$11,074,658	\$8,164,812	51.4	13.0	6.1	11.5	127.4	271.5	144.1	0.9	Acceptable
Greene, Inc.	109	\$10,307	\$1,130,223	\$550,771	48.0	7.7	4.4	10.3	21.4	24.8	10.6	1.3	Acceptable
Greenville, Inc.	709	\$0,416	\$4,002,844	\$2,041,161	52.7	11.7	5.6	10.7	69.0	120.0	60.0	0.9	Acceptable
Greene, Inc.	402	\$9,388	\$3,002,739	\$1,408,821	41.8	11.6	5.6	11.0	38.8	73.1	38.6	1.0	Acceptable
Greene, Inc.	791	\$7,382	\$8,016,432	\$3,407,843	58.0	9.5	4.6	8.7	43.3	164.8	81.6	1.0	Recognized
Greene, Inc.	210	\$7,380	\$1,507,050	\$700,308	46.4	11.1	0.0	13.1	18.0	30.0	10.0	1.2	Acceptable
Greene, Inc.	104	\$16,172	\$1,600,000	\$771,238	48.1	6.8	2.0	6.0	17.0	35.0	17.0	1.1	Recognized
Greene, Inc.	631	\$7,813	\$4,000,000	\$2,001,782	50.0	10.4	6.4	11.2	60.7	110.0	50.0	1.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	1,072	\$0,806	\$3,700,110	\$1,400,059	41.4	13.1	0.7	13.7	78.0	182.5	74.5	1.0	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	108	\$7,818	\$855,144	\$466,762	55.1	13.3	7.1	19.2	6.1	15.2	7.1	1.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	3,732	\$0,078	\$22,000,000	\$10,775,822	47.8	14.3	0.4	11.0	201.0	632.1	322.1	0.8	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	838	\$0,801	\$0,443,000	\$3,167,112	46.0	11.0	5.4	10.1	80.0	173.1	82.5	0.9	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	623	\$7,310	\$3,423,130	\$1,800,884	47.1	10.8	6.1	8.6	48.0	102.0	54.0	0.9	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	1,705	\$5,877	\$10,000,000	\$4,000,000	40.8	14.5	0.3	19.4	123.1	218.1	92.0	1.3	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	215	\$0,107	\$1,070,000	\$880,702	48.5	10.0	5.3	11.3	21.5	40.5	18.1	1.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	1,284	\$5,358	\$0,850,350	\$3,470,821	50.0	12.8	0.0	13.0	100.4	194.7	84.3	1.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	2,130	\$0,128	\$13,052,040	\$0,844,004	43.2	14.0	7.2	4.3	470.1	908.0	485.9	0.8	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	14,088	\$7,078	\$99,714,804	\$44,872,289	44.8	14.8	0.5	321.0	68.0	112.8	43.9	1.0	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	928	\$0,068	\$4,181,240	\$2,159,828	51.8	11.4	0.0	4.7	110.9	290.3	133.8	0.8	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	17,051	\$0,203	\$106,782,353	\$8,476,054	51.8	18.7	7.4	13.4	313.0	644.0	330.4	0.9	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	1,088	\$0,484	\$0,838,872	\$3,431,333	52.8	12.7	6.1	13.4	78.3	180.5	79.3	1.0	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	889	\$7,884	\$3,777,000	\$1,889,434	44.2	12.7	0.0	13.7	39.4	79.8	38.4	1.1	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	129	\$8,040	\$1,032,180	\$347,020	52.8	8.3	0.1	17.7	13.9	21.1	7.3	1.0	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	341	\$7,810	\$2,007,210	\$1,376,329	51.1	10.8	4.9	9.1	32.2	69.0	37.4	0.8	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	184	\$0,430	\$1,482,220	\$731,019	50.4	8.2	5.2	12.0	18.7	26.8	12.9	1.3	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	388	\$8,182	\$2,402,499	\$1,254,103	52.2	12.8	7.1	0.9	488.8	882.8	434.0	1.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	891	\$0,308	\$4,010,028	\$2,489,744	50.3	11.0	6.6	11.0	63.7	107.8	53.7	1.0	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	748	\$0,087	\$3,212,165	\$2,809,980	53.9	11.0	6.2	13.3	84.2	120.2	65.9	1.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	748	\$0,850	\$9,123,000	\$2,707,471	54.8	11.1	8.4	18.1	87.4	118.0	49.5	1.4	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	8,082	\$8,203	\$50,084,238	\$25,400,049	44.8	15.7	8.4	18.1	670.0	1077.8	601.1	1.2	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	1,178	\$7,132	\$8,488,028	\$4,448,104	52.0	13.8	6.7	9.7	85.4	208.8	121.4	0.7	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	194	\$0,018	\$1,749,104	\$048,014	54.2	7.7	4.8	11.4	25.2	42.2	17.0	1.5	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	881	\$7,074	\$8,708,114	\$3,080,344	45.4	12.2	0.4	13.5	78.8	150.2	71.4	1.1	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	1,478	\$0,082	\$9,070,502	\$4,859,878	48.7	12.4	0.1	12.0	115.0	233.8	118.8	1.0	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	3,488	\$8,204	\$21,870,849	\$10,898,054	50.4	14.0	8.0	10.5	248.8	580.8	331.9	0.8	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	1,038	\$7,120	\$7,387,889	\$3,942,083	53.3	12.2	6.0	18.0	65.7	150.8	65.4	1.3	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	3,838	\$5,708	\$22,471,805	\$10,821,300	48.8	14.3	7.8	10.2	275.8	618.3	242.8	1.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	182	\$8,314	\$1,283,728	\$885,090	55.0	12.1	0.7	18.0	12.0	22.7	10.1	1.2	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	728	\$8,808	\$9,095,770	\$2,739,158	54.7	12.0	0.9	10.2	60.5	105.2	44.7	1.4	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	3,187	\$0,783	\$21,350,701	\$10,488,842	49.5	14.4	8.4	11.5	219.2	493.3	274.0	0.8	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	118	\$11,019	\$1,405,070	\$872,492	58.5	6.8	4.5	14.1	17.9	28.7	6.3	2.1	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	207	\$7,841	\$2,040,147	\$780,875	37.3	13.8	5.8	9.5	19.8	47.7	28.0	0.7	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	211	\$7,155	\$1,500,705	\$730,887	48.4	10.8	6.2	14.8	10.5	34.0	14.5	1.3	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	832	\$0,510	\$5,418,320	\$2,981,078	49.5	16.0	0.1	0.4	233.0	4388.3	2050.2	1.1	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	0,074	\$3,617	\$52,318,558	\$21,408,820	40.8	13.2	8.9	14.5	480.2	880.3	420.1	1.1	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	1,018	\$0,816	\$12,388,870	\$5,525,783	44.8	13.2	5.3	9.9	137.7	343.0	209.3	0.7	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	1,193	\$7,189	\$8,452,817	\$3,412,484	50.0	15.1	5.0	9.7	70.0	202.2	123.2	0.0	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	515	\$0,582	\$5,448,330	\$1,000,887	47.8	11.9	0.1	12.5	43.3	84.4	41.1	1.1	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	838	\$0,688	\$5,738,304	\$3,203,789	57.4	12.2	6.0	15.9	70.3	174.3	54.0	1.3	Recognized
Greeneville, Inc.	2,175	\$0,228	\$13,541,550	\$7,053,148	52.1	12.5	0.2	12.3	174.0	350.8	178.8	1.0	Acceptable
Greeneville, Inc.	888	\$8,720	\$4,488,880	\$2,370,171	52.8	10.8	0.3	18.3	81.9	102.8	40.9	1.5	Acceptable

Kennedy Jsd	801	\$7,050	\$5,500,055	\$3,421,207	52.0	10.8	4.9	0.0	70.7	175.7	08.0	0.8	Acceptable
Kennard Jsd	345	\$9,230	\$2,822,055	\$1,028,084	57.2	0.1	5.1	11.1	37.1	0.0	30.0	1.2	Acceptable
Kennedain Jsd	2,038	\$5,771	\$10,055,100	\$8,018,434	52.6	15.6	8.6	19.2	188.3	341.6	153.5	1.2	Recognized
Kern Jsd	734	\$8,357	\$4,000,004	\$2,500,000	55.4	12.6	6.6	3.6	277.1	430.8	200.7	1.1	Acceptable
Kernell Jsd	1,202	\$7,371	\$0,002,202	\$4,000,001	50.1	12.4	5.8	9.8	101.8	220.8	127.7	0.8	Acceptable
Kerrville Jsd	4,771	\$8,700	\$22,024,000	\$13,040,300	40.4	14.0	7.1	14.4	340.8	632.0	331.2	1.0	Recognized
Kilgus Jsd	3,000	\$0,004	\$22,200,010	\$11,320,047	50.0	13.4	7.1	19.1	273.8	510.4	243.0	1.1	Acceptable
Killeen Jsd	32,583	\$0,703	\$221,300,310	\$114,200,441	51.6	13.0	7.2	19.3	2305.8	4535.4	2120.0	1.1	Acceptable
Kingsville Jsd	4,004	\$8,100	\$28,035,700	\$16,707,010	51.0	14.7	0.2	10.7	300.1	722.0	423.0	0.7	Acceptable
Kirbyville Jsd	39,650	\$0,700	\$0,210,002	\$4,630,000	46.2	14.0	7.8	14.7	119.0	227.5	108.8	1.1	Acceptable
Klein Jsd	170	\$10,471	\$21,001,000	\$13,000,500	53.1	10.1	0.3	22.6	2043.7	3027.5	1583.8	1.3	Acceptable
Klondike Jsd	260	\$0,823	\$1,071,035	\$0,174,530	40.0	11.7	4.9	8.4	18.0	39.0	20.0	0.7	Acceptable
Knapall Jsd	280	\$0,404	\$2,172,074	\$1,300,004	48.0	0.4	4.2	8.4	34.0	68.1	34.0	1.1	Recognized
Knox City-Orbison Jsd	310	\$0,871	\$2,104,076	\$1,170,000	54.0	11.0	0.0	10.0	28.0	46.2	10.3	1.5	Recognized
Koppell Jsd	1,400	\$0,001	\$1,004,404	\$4,610,055	53.2	13.1	0.4	12.6	107.6	220.0	112.5	1.0	Acceptable
Kovance Jsd	249	\$10,284	\$2,819,800	\$1,274,007	50.6	8.8	4.4	9.0	28.9	55.7	27.2	1.0	Acceptable
Kraus Jsd	1,248	\$0,711	\$8,376,320	\$3,030,404	47.0	12.7	7.0	4.5	230.0	610.7	274.7	0.8	Acceptable
La Fain Jsd	2,800	\$0,183	\$17,024,017	\$9,028,488	53.7	14.4	0.0	45.8	77.3	140.3	63.2	1.2	Acceptable
La Gloria Jsd	84	\$7,720	\$728,680	\$343,247	47.3	12.0	6.0	11.0	7.8	15.6	8.1	1.0	Recognized
La Grange Jsd	1,905	\$8,303	\$12,436,305	\$9,002,058	53.1	13.0	0.7	12.9	139.9	280.3	150.4	0.9	Acceptable
La Grava Jsd	21,768	\$8,878	\$143,104,874	\$88,660,340	48.0	0.1	8.1	9.8	429.8	2087.0	2201.1	0.2	Acceptable
La Marque Jsd	3,780	\$8,722	\$25,207,500	\$11,207,743	44.7	15.3	7.9	10.3	245.1	474.7	229.6	1.1	Acceptable
La Porte Jsd	7,086	\$8,704	\$91,087,200	\$23,472,312	49.3	16.3	7.2	12.8	408.4	1008.8	602.4	0.8	Acceptable
La Reynier Jsd	499	\$8,779	\$3,111,481	\$1,440,087	40.0	12.4	0.7	14.0	37.0	68.6	31.3	1.2	Acceptable
La Playa Jsd	477	\$7,488	\$3,018,972	\$2,004,001	59.4	12.2	8.0	7.0	47.7	110.1	68.4	0.7	Acceptable
La Vega Jsd	2,020	\$7,130	\$18,744,770	\$8,307,657	44.8	12.9	8.4	12.7	203.8	410.8	207.0	1.0	Acceptable
La Verania Jsd	2,410	\$5,070	\$14,441,430	\$7,177,301	49.7	15.8	8.2	10.9	132.1	285.0	142.9	1.1	Recognized
La Villa Jsd	987	\$8,844	\$4,701,878	\$2,159,139	49.9	12.8	9.1	8.4	93.3	134.7	81.6	0.7	Acceptable
Largo Vista Jsd	1,084	\$8,882	\$7,638,308	\$3,487,000	46.7	13.7	7.4	42.5	32.3	68.1	25.7	1.3	Recognized
Lake Dallas Jsd	3,978	\$8,083	\$21,704,074	\$10,447,188	48.0	14.0	7.3	14.0	245.1	490.1	249.1	1.0	Acceptable
Lake Travis Jsd	4,818	\$8,402	\$39,844,830	\$13,940,331	44.9	15.8	6.7	19.2	303.0	553.8	260.8	1.2	Recognized
Lake Worth Jsd	2,302	\$8,202	\$14,809,184	\$9,913,100	46.8	13.1	7.4	17.0	182.6	323.2	140.6	1.3	Acceptable
Lamar Central Jsd	17,884	\$8,570	\$117,827,259	\$9,340,228	52.2	19.4	8.1	17.1	1180.0	2205.4	1049.4	1.1	Acceptable
Lamar Jsd	2,127	\$8,087	\$12,888,319	\$8,434,304	52.7	13.0	0.2	0.4	1032.5	5833.8	4801.0	0.2	Acceptable
Lampasas Jsd	3,289	\$8,137	\$10,849,250	\$9,852,094	48.4	14.5	7.0	13.5	224.1	464.3	240.1	0.9	Recognized
Lancaster Jsd	4,754	\$8,600	\$28,674,860	\$17,277,585	48.2	15.0	7.8	15.3	209.0	600.5	310.5	1.0	Acceptable
Lancaster Jsd	201	\$8,087	\$1,821,487	\$778,304	48.0	7.0	4.0	8.4	26.4	50.3	23.8	1.1	Recognized
Laredo Jsd	2,848	\$8,174	\$153,309,204	\$70,153,999	51.6	43.6	7.2	8.6	589.9	3490.8	2881.0	0.2	Acceptable
Laramie Jsd	322	\$7,208	\$2,820,010	\$1,987,200	48.0	13.5	6.7	0.0	23.9	58.5	32.6	0.7	Acceptable
Lathrop Jsd	447	\$8,583	\$2,842,801	\$1,480,128	50.3	9.8	6.0	15.2	45.2	74.5	20.3	1.6	Acceptable
Lazaville Jsd	180	\$0,260	\$1,888,800	\$848,401	50.0	0.4	4.0	7.0	19.1	45.0	25.9	0.7	Recognized
Leaky Jsd	282	\$8,301	\$2,340,882	\$1,228,083	52.5	9.1	4.3	8.2	31.0	65.9	34.6	0.8	Recognized
Leander Jsd	19,701	\$9,210	\$113,029,210	\$49,959,460	44.7	14.7	9.5	28.9	1239.2	1915.9	677.7	1.8	Recognized
Leary Jsd	110	\$7,040	\$844,880	\$530,088	56.1	10.1	6.3	18.7	11.8	18.9	7.1	1.7	Acceptable
Leola Jsd	192	\$8,414	\$1,616,488	\$739,270	45.7	11.3	5.2	9.0	17.0	38.9	19.0	0.9	Acceptable
Leppell Jsd	207	\$7,708	\$2,082,088	\$945,258	45.4	12.1	5.9	11.5	22.1	45.3	23.2	1.0	Acceptable
Leon Jsd	634	\$8,342	\$3,455,608	\$2,755,112	50.5	11.2	6.0	12.8	58.4	109.0	60.9	1.2	Acceptable
Leon Jsd	780	\$8,623	\$9,402,247	\$7,807,133	51.3	14.0	6.7	12.8	50.4	117.8	61.4	0.9	Recognized
Loveland Jsd	3,008	\$8,433	\$10,035,807	\$11,263,769	56.5	12.8	6.0	11.3	242.1	518.5	274.4	0.8	Acceptable
Lovington Jsd	248	\$7,880	\$1,801,812	\$1,019,429	53.6	11.0	6.5	15.9	72.5	38.2	15.0	1.4	Recognized
Lovington Jsd	44,024	\$0,737	\$208,680,888	\$154,708,486	52.5	13.0	9.2	27.2	3197.2	4785.2	1616.0	2.0	Acceptable
Lovington Jsd	1,047	\$8,302	\$0,092,424	\$3,312,780	49.5	12.4	6.4	13.2	84.4	103.6	78.2	1.1	Acceptable
Liberty Hill Jsd	1,767	\$8,593	\$11,847,621	\$8,094,134	51.1	14.1	7.6	7.4	207.4	451.5	244.0	0.9	Recognized

Liberty, Inc.	2,347	\$5,878	\$14,030,958	\$7,189,517	51.1	14.9	9.2	10.8	180.8	378.5	217.8	0.7	Acceptable
Liberty, Elyan, Inc.	2,725	\$6,164	\$19,708,990	\$8,247,278	49.1	13.3	7.1	15.2	204.0	383.8	178.9	1.1	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	3,109	\$6,161	\$18,974,277	\$8,031,342	47.6	14.0	7.0	18.1	272.1	393.0	171.9	1.3	Recognized
Liberty-Kellogg, Corp. Inc.	400	\$7,078	\$8,283,044	\$3,651,320	48.2	11.2	6.0	12.0	10.3	140.0	140.7	1.2	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	408	\$6,387	\$2,689,116	\$1,742,688	68.5	13.3	6.0	22.2	214.4	451.0	217.2	1.0	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	200	\$7,110	\$1,892,054	\$1,160,420	61.2	11.0	6.7	18.3	22.4	39.7	17.5	1.3	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	203	\$5,801	\$1,720,091	\$749,797	44.0	11.7	6.5	14.8	26.0	49.1	20.0	1.3	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	3,000	\$6,164	\$22,707,349	\$11,151,232	48.6	16.0	7.8	16.0	240.0	493.2	240.0	1.0	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	3,484	\$9,287	\$21,709,448	\$9,649,132	45.0	16.7	6.8	20.1	221.9	388.8	153.0	1.7	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	1,482	\$5,410	\$8,020,512	\$4,204,184	53.5	15.0	6.0	12.4	95.0	214.8	118.0	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	4,048	\$9,080	\$24,850,880	\$13,001,380	53.0	16.1	7.0	13.0	248.1	570.3	310.2	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	1,018	\$9,701	\$12,030,110	\$5,049,211	44.0	13.8	6.0	10.8	138.8	310.3	180.0	0.8	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	4,493	\$9,011	\$27,019,445	\$12,000,363	48.1	14.7	7.8	10.8	303.8	670.3	270.0	1.1	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	697	\$7,310	\$4,050,070	\$2,769,049	67.4	10.8	6.1	14.0	101.0	108.1	44.4	1.4	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	102	\$12,120	\$1,230,240	\$810,488	66.4	8.2	3.8	7.1	12.4	20.6	14.4	0.8	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	322	\$9,080	\$1,050,072	\$1,000,002	94.0	11.2	6.7	11.0	28.8	58.8	27.7	1.0	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	189	\$7,168	\$1,358,184	\$688,091	51.4	12.4	7.8	21.0	15.2	24.2	9.0	1.7	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	848	\$5,878	\$1,050,020	\$2,373,701	47.0	13.3	7.2	2.0	322.7	640.0	320.8	1.0	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	8,201	\$9,143	\$5,831,813	\$2,659,354	49.2	14.5	6.7	12.5	671.8	1237.5	888.7	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	134	\$16,000	\$2,011,072	\$872,805	43.4	7.7	3.9	7.8	17.4	34.4	17.0	1.0	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	189	\$8,214	\$1,380,080	\$703,033	51.8	10.1	8.5	12.1	10.3	30.0	13.7	1.2	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	11,357	\$6,164	\$7,837,410	\$3,837,783	49.8	19.0	6.0	25.0	99.8	102.2	62.4	1.0	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	324	\$10,280	\$3,132,084	\$1,423,027	45.7	8.2	3.0	4.7	39.5	108.0	88.5	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	7,110	\$8,342	\$47,078,470	\$21,004,827	48.3	19.7	7.4	14.0	478.3	1014.8	530.0	0.8	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	490	\$6,792	\$3,361,000	\$1,631,407	40.7	12.2	6.2	12.0	41.0	80.8	36.7	1.0	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	693	\$7,078	\$7,078,434	\$3,120,834	44.4	14.4	8.8	0.8	143.5	2187.4	1231.9	0.8	Exempt
Liberty, Inc.	593	\$7,020	\$3,882,080	\$2,284,287	58.1	11.4	6.7	10.3	48.5	82.8	34.0	1.4	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	20,020	\$8,105	\$177,187,100	\$83,012,728	52.8	14.2	8.0	14.0	2208.9	4284.1	2075.5	1.1	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	2,408	\$8,321	\$19,792,808	\$7,789,474	48.0	14.0	7.5	10.2	172.0	321.1	149.1	1.2	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	151	\$8,473	\$1,430,423	\$688,003	48.0	7.3	3.7	7.5	20.7	40.8	20.1	1.0	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	8,202	\$5,782	\$47,838,084	\$23,689,870	50.1	13.0	6.8	12.8	693.8	1234.8	650.0	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	1,616	\$7,109	\$1,010,235	\$7,163,515	61.7	14.1	7.5	58.1	37.1	84.8	27.8	1.3	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	3,488	\$5,810	\$20,484,080	\$10,078,188	49.2	14.4	7.8	49.3	85.7	172.3	76.8	1.3	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	1,893	\$7,326	\$1,022,020	\$4,840,168	44.8	14.2	6.9	9.0	100.0	273.8	187.7	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	1,842	\$6,822	\$6,077,824	\$3,815,448	62.8	15.5	6.5	11.2	69.5	237.2	137.7	0.7	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	3,288	\$8,278	\$20,489,082	\$10,311,841	50.4	14.2	7.0	18.1	218.5	433.8	215.3	1.0	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	2,177	\$6,052	\$13,175,204	\$5,888,387	45.3	14.2	7.2	14.0	153.3	302.4	149.1	1.0	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	8,188	\$5,831	\$51,439,185	\$24,330,735	47.3	14.9	8.8	10.8	613.1	1074.7	481.8	1.3	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	1,148	\$7,030	\$8,070,440	\$3,873,811	48.0	12.7	6.3	12.8	90.4	182.2	81.8	1.0	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	63	\$10,642	\$8,070,440	\$2,755,553	41.1	7.8	1.9	2.5	8.3	33.2	24.9	0.3	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	140	\$5,857	\$8,113,322	\$4,300,001	53.0	11.9	6.9	14.3	12.3	22.8	10.2	1.2	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	3,227	\$8,830	\$22,040,410	\$11,438,873	51.0	18.1	6.3	17.1	200.4	388.8	188.4	1.1	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	21,080	\$5,883	\$120,001,080	\$64,281,010	51.0	18.0	10.3	28.0	1310.3	2044.7	728.4	1.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	67	\$17,743	\$1,188,781	\$639,584	53.8	4.8	3.0	8.0	14.0	22.3	8.4	1.7	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	3,703	\$7,107	\$26,317,221	\$12,421,728	47.2	14.1	7.0	13.0	282.8	570.0	288.4	1.0	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	450	\$8,084	\$3,877,184	\$1,639,347	44.5	9.8	6.0	10.2	46.5	91.2	44.7	1.0	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	48	\$11,773	\$541,558	\$284,822	48.9	8.0	2.0	4.5	5.8	15.0	10.1	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	1,382	\$5,630	\$7,830,080	\$3,110,110	39.8	15.1	6.0	11.7	92.2	210.9	118.7	0.8	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	1,424	\$9,687	\$6,322,288	\$4,240,040	44.8	13.0	4.9	26.7	48.0	101.3	53.3	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	5,880	\$5,718	\$33,821,840	\$18,230,349	48.3	14.2	6.4	11.7	414.1	818.8	504.7	0.8	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	693	\$7,237	\$4,725,781	\$1,880,849	47.1	12.8	3.8	24.4	44.9	71.3	26.7	1.7	Acceptable
Liberty, Inc.	402	\$7,018	\$3,462,858	\$1,785,127	51.7	12.1	6.4	2.7	138.2	317.9	181.8	0.8	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	341	\$8,388	\$2,181,718	\$1,128,700	51.0	10.8	3.9	13.0	31.8	57.8	20.2	1.2	Recognized
Liberty, Inc.	613	\$7,448	\$4,885,824	\$1,898,053	47.0	11.8	3.7	11.2	52.8	107.5	54.7	1.0	Acceptable

Managada, Inc.	1,894	\$20,970	\$1,877,148	\$5,165,153	\$7.4	8.1	3.8	1.4	8.0	19.0	9.0	0.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	400	\$5,720	\$2,764,720	\$1,487,649	54.0	12.0	7.4	17.4	37.2	64.0	21.7	0.7	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	284	\$7,220	\$2,092,114	\$1,487,649	40.6	12.0	0.8	1.4	42.8	142.0	80.0	0.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	141	\$7,143	\$6,721,663	\$3,169,464	47.6	12.0	0.8	1.4	72.0	142.0	80.0	1.0	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	23,492	\$9,450	\$18,053,640	\$10,464,173	62.6	41.0	7.2	6.7	64.7	320.8	200.1	0.2	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	404	\$13,602	\$8,183,016	\$2,743,243	43.8	11.6	4.0	6.5	40.3	164.0	25.3	0.7	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	230	\$7,051	\$1,004,000	\$1,021,464	64.0	10.7	5.7	2.0	83.1	164.0	91.6	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	1,140	\$7,000	\$1,043,000	\$1,716,783	47.1	11.0	5.7	21.4	87.8	141.0	53.7	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	10,003	\$0,206	\$163,400,667	\$46,000,492	44.4	13.1	10.8	37.0	110.6	164.0	43.4	2.3	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	189	\$9,000	\$1,828,000	\$749,431	47.5	11.0	7.5	21.2	10.2	20.2	6.0	1.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	479	\$0,262	\$3,013,800	\$1,033,810	46.2	11.4	0.0	15.7	42.0	72.0	30.0	1.4	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	100	\$18,073	\$2,330,000	\$900,000	20.7	8.1	3.7	0.8	10.8	43.2	23.6	0.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	284	\$7,200	\$2,161,200	\$1,080,184	47.0	13.0	0.0	12.7	20.8	43.0	22.0	0.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	143	\$10,169	\$1,403,456	\$1,814,413	64.8	9.7	0.1	10.6	55.4	87.3	31.0	1.1	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	3,000	\$8,287	\$18,479,441	\$9,892,877	40.3	15.8	7.1	12.0	100.1	423.0	232.0	0.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	62	\$12,070	\$3,600,300	\$348,433	63.0	6.7	3.1	0.0	6.1	10.8	7.7	1.2	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	631	\$0,074	\$3,062,218	\$1,400,109	40.8	13.0	8.0	19.0	30.5	60.4	27.0	1.4	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	534	\$7,680	\$4,060,824	\$2,029,482	60.0	11.2	4.0	12.8	39.1	80.8	41.7	0.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	380	\$1,703	\$3,420,477	\$1,000,077	48.7	10.0	3.0	0.1	30.9	102.4	83.5	0.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	5,342	\$9,800	\$18,785,012	\$17,814,301	48.7	18.0	9.4	38.4	141.0	289.0	139.0	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	500	\$8,681	\$3,124,660	\$1,612,282	48.4	11.8	7.0	21.4	40.8	72.4	25.0	1.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	1,300	\$9,074	\$9,647,408	\$6,337,000	49.9	12.0	8.1	12.4	114.1	224.4	110.3	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	34,414	\$0,018	\$207,103,452	\$89,10,200	40.8	15.7	8.5	18.3	105.7	404.7	189.7	1.2	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	2,330	\$0,784	\$19,847,424	\$8,430,830	63.2	14.1	0.0	12.4	101.1	20.0	19.0	1.0	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	189	\$0,378	\$1,360,888	\$894,839	60.1	18.5	7.8	15.7	10.1	20.0	19.0	1.0	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	189	\$0,102	\$1,731,018	\$812,120	48.9	7.3	4.0	8.8	20.8	47.3	21.4	1.2	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	20,021	\$9,842	\$172,420,082	\$84,842,877	52.8	14.0	7.4	15.1	104.1	278.5	138.4	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	6,300	\$7,091	\$30,203,030	\$15,087,849	41.0	14.5	7.5	15.9	372.1	719.3	347.3	1.1	Acceptable
Manila, Inc. (City)	143	\$8,081	\$1,284,263	\$880,070	53.0	8.0	4.7	10.0	10.1	30.4	14.4	1.1	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	8,882	\$9,800	\$18,818,838	\$18,813,420	49.5	18.0	7.8	13.8	37.8	744.8	378.0	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	400	\$7,144	\$2,057,600	\$1,488,808	61.4	11.8	5.7	10.0	33.0	70.2	38.0	0.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	688	\$5,137	\$3,444,878	\$1,388,285	40.3	12.3	0.0	14.2	64.3	101.2	48.0	1.2	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	437	\$8,875	\$3,700,078	\$2,170,811	57.5	10.0	5.4	11.7	43.7	80.0	37.2	1.2	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	178	\$8,855	\$1,570,100	\$809,433	61.1	10.7	0.0	17.2	18.0	27.0	10.3	1.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	264	\$7,378	\$1,800,232	\$948,722	52.7	10.3	4.7	8.0	23.7	61.0	28.2	0.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	771	\$5,145	\$5,508,715	\$2,845,083	46.2	12.8	7.8	20.4	59.8	97.0	37.8	1.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	1,801	\$5,905	\$9,453,005	\$8,082,889	50.9	14.2	8.1	18.9	112.7	197.7	84.0	1.3	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	3,684	\$0,310	\$23,270,190	\$12,038,624	51.8	14.1	0.7	9.8	278.3	653.1	378.8	0.7	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	50	\$18,080	\$333,000	\$309,889	39.3	7.5	3.8	7.7	6.7	13.2	6.5	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	14,094	\$8,808	\$3,104,084	\$4,578,037	51.1	19.5	7.3	147.8	97.3	192.7	95.3	1.0	Acceptable
Manila, Inc. (Wickville-Pyram)	1,884	\$8,842	\$13,437,888	\$8,908,972	61.4	14.8	0.7	34.1	72.3	120.0	57.6	1.3	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	97	\$8,480	\$889,830	\$204,085	51.7	11.3	0.0	17.7	6.9	9.7	3.8	1.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	501	\$7,005	\$3,500,505	\$1,540,873	43.0	19.4	0.7	11.3	30.5	74.8	44.2	0.7	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	4,840	\$8,402	\$30,122,880	\$14,010,820	49.5	19.1	0.3	22.0	288.2	408.0	210.7	1.4	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	727	\$8,498	\$4,727,502	\$2,897,478	53.0	17.9	7.0	9.0	122.0	271.5	140.8	0.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	72	\$17,583	\$1,284,536	\$913,300	48.5	4.8	2.6	5.5	15.7	28.8	13.1	1.2	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	140	\$8,600	\$1,282,741	\$570,789	45.7	9.5	5.1	11.0	15.7	29.2	13.9	1.2	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	100	\$8,600	\$693,946	\$386,243	67.1	12.4	8.8	0.1	705.0	1746.3	950.4	0.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	941	\$8,408	\$4,581,188	\$2,345,588	51.2	10.7	4.6	8.1	50.8	117.0	67.0	0.8	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	184	\$8,785	\$1,706,700	\$886,218	55.0	8.2	3.8	8.4	72.4	91.1	28.7	0.8	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	337	\$7,028	\$2,368,436	\$1,413,060	59.7	10.4	6.0	14.2	56.2	60.2	23.8	1.4	Recognized
Manila, Inc.	113	\$7,701	\$870,093	\$380,032	48.5	8.5	4.0	6.9	11.9	28.3	10.4	0.7	Acceptable
Manila, Inc.	470	\$8,351	\$2,687,420	\$1,487,081	55.0	11.9	7.7	21.8	35.3	54.5	19.3	1.8	Acceptable

Paul Creek Ltd	104	\$11,500	\$1,100,000	\$275,276	48.1	0.7	3.4	8.9	15.5	30.9	13.1	1.0	Acceptable
Paul Creek Ltd	154	\$9,250	\$1,425,424	\$899,995	48.4	0.3	4.5	8.7	16.5	34.2	17.7	0.9	Acceptable
Palencia Ltd	1,001	\$7,210	\$12,133,418	\$0,521,800	51.8	1.4	6.7	12.5	110.7	250.9	134.2	0.9	Recognized
Palencia Ltd	3,310	\$9,204	\$20,709,136	\$9,209,732	49.3	1.4	6.7	17.4	171.3	301.3	100.1	0.9	Acceptable
Palmer Ltd	1,000	\$9,828	\$13,043,175	\$0,000,000	50.5	12.3	6.0	14.2	162.5	392.0	140.4	1.2	Acceptable
Palo Pinto Ltd	118	\$9,893	\$1,137,095	\$404,100	40.8	10.0	5.6	11.1	10.0	20.0	10.4	1.0	Unsupervised
Pampa Ltd	3,200	\$9,649	\$19,560,201	\$9,030,001	50.8	14.1	6.7	32.2	172.0	276.1	102.2	1.7	Acceptable
Pampa Ltd	703	\$7,638	\$6,200,214	\$2,006,072	54.5	11.5	5.8	12.1	11.1	110.2	58.0	1.1	Recognized
Panther Creek Corp Ltd	104	\$11,020	\$2,139,432	\$1,020,500	47.7	10.2	4.0	8.4	10.0	42.2	23.2	0.8	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	800	\$9,044	\$0,378,240	\$0,000,000	46.1	11.0	7.6	20.3	90.7	126.0	47.3	1.7	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	3,045	\$9,853	\$23,000,000	\$11,037,403	50.4	12.0	9.0	11.0	113.1	667.5	344.4	0.9	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	40,152	\$9,835	\$200,200,020	\$141,010,477	52.7	15.7	8.7	10.5	203.0	630.4	230.2	1.2	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	143	\$11,000	\$1,072,528	\$0,000,000	46.0	6.7	3.6	0.7	10.4	37.0	21.2	0.8	Unsupervised
Paradise Ltd	135	\$11,025	\$1,700,075	\$0,000,000	39.3	13.0	0.2	0.7	11.0	28.8	17.9	0.7	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	13,000	\$9,303	\$0,320,040	\$0,240,400	45.8	10.0	0.5	22.2	78.0	137.5	50.0	1.3	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	2,287	\$9,110	\$1,073,570	\$0,000,000	47.0	14.0	7.0	14.0	103.4	320.7	104.4	1.0	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	842	\$9,183	\$9,700,120	\$3,200,007	50.0	12.7	0.4	12.9	74.2	147.2	73.0	1.0	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	2,340	\$9,030	\$10,000,000	\$7,500,437	48.5	14.4	5.9	10.0	102.0	397.0	234.7	0.7	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	180	\$7,888	\$1,489,788	\$0,180,000	55.1	8.9	0.7	13.0	20.0	32.0	11.7	1.8	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	340	\$7,417	\$2,400,282	\$1,242,080	48.4	11.8	7.2	18.5	26.3	48.1	18.7	1.0	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	1,004	\$9,017	\$1,540,028	\$0,174,390	53.5	13.8	7.0	14.2	143.8	283.4	139.7	1.0	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	328	\$9,809	\$2,401,452	\$1,424,112	55.0	12.1	0.1	12.3	27.1	53.8	20.7	1.0	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	521	\$9,003	\$3,007,000	\$1,011,082	44.8	12.5	0.3	23.7	28.0	50.0	22.0	1.3	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	303	\$9,320	\$3,200,010	\$1,500,344	49.8	11.7	0.0	8.7	32.0	77.0	44.1	0.7	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	903	\$9,484	\$3,895,042	\$3,518,680	50.1	12.0	0.0	10.5	79.4	165.2	85.0	0.9	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	10,002	\$9,707	\$9,000,004	\$4,042,253	47.7	10.3	10.4	20.5	1017.9	1800.2	502.3	1.8	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	20,403	\$9,514	\$172,878,402	\$88,359,000	51.2	30.9	7.0	9.4	064.0	3489.0	2821.0	0.2	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	1,487	\$9,840	\$10,180,002	\$5,100,181	50.1	12.1	0.2	12.7	122.0	239.8	110.9	1.1	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	4,043	\$9,711	\$20,018,173	\$13,410,184	50.0	14.1	7.9	18.0	329.3	610.1	289.8	1.1	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	2,333	\$9,897	\$13,787,701	\$7,181,520	52.2	14.1	6.5	12.1	169.5	359.0	193.5	0.9	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	451	\$10,707	\$4,028,057	\$1,007,390	39.5	8.8	4.0	11.1	51.3	92.0	40.8	1.3	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	0,001	\$9,484	\$33,403,044	\$17,839,988	52.3	14.8	6.8	20.5	411.0	708.3	296.7	1.4	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	81,800	\$7,023	\$304,275,087	\$189,416,477	50.8	13.0	8.8	21.0	3731.8	6102.2	2370.7	1.8	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	1,028	\$9,590	\$10,703,000	\$5,270,579	49.3	13.8	8.4	22.0	141.5	229.2	87.6	1.0	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	3,408	\$7,847	\$20,300,400	\$14,078,070	55.0	13.7	6.3	11.7	255.3	555.2	209.0	0.9	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	678	\$9,304	\$0,309,112	\$2,020,950	48.3	0.8	5.1	10.0	70.8	132.0	62.3	1.1	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	2,550	\$9,115	\$19,078,040	\$7,580,521	48.5	14.7	8.2	18.5	173.0	311.7	137.8	1.3	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	631	\$7,008	\$0,571,848	\$3,443,491	52.4	11.0	6.8	10.4	71.0	122.2	50.6	1.4	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	489	\$7,870	\$3,852,831	\$1,880,182	48.8	11.2	6.7	10.7	43.7	73.0	29.3	1.5	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	574	\$9,174	\$4,681,878	\$2,040,980	43.5	12.8	6.6	13.0	44.8	87.0	42.1	1.1	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	10,387	\$9,028	\$97,400,978	\$31,637,260	50.7	10.1	7.1	12.7	843.3	1458.7	815.4	0.8	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	4,753	\$9,870	\$3,171,187	\$19,220,710	48.0	14.5	7.6	10.0	377.8	675.4	207.6	1.1	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	987	\$7,875	\$7,772,075	\$4,158,354	53.5	11.2	6.1	13.4	88.1	161.8	73.7	1.2	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	1,009	\$9,870	\$11,875,050	\$9,320,469	54.6	14.0	6.9	12.1	170.4	250.2	139.9	0.9	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	731	\$9,428	\$4,097,408	\$2,447,340	52.1	13.4	7.5	17.0	54.6	97.5	42.0	1.3	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	1,351	\$7,007	\$9,480,457	\$4,057,497	40.2	13.4	0.8	33.3	53.3	93.0	40.8	1.3	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	711	\$8,106	\$1,710,300	\$955,183	50.0	9.5	5.1	11.0	22.2	41.4	18.2	1.2	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	135	\$8,304	\$1,121,040	\$803,120	53.8	8.4	5.4	15.1	10.1	23.0	8.0	1.8	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	1,009	\$9,717	\$0,111,473	\$3,280,638	53.5	14.4	6.3	10.8	74.2	128.8	54.8	1.4	Recognized
Paradise Ltd	940	\$7,402	\$0,957,880	\$3,395,445	48.8	10.2	6.3	16.5	02.2	140.2	57.0	1.0	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	1,525	\$9,075	\$0,284,375	\$4,400,878	47.5	14.8	0.9	12.9	103.0	221.0	118.0	0.9	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	107	\$9,849	\$9,480,036	\$2.6	52.6	7.5	4.7	12.0	14.3	22.8	8.5	1.7	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	2,234	\$9,185	\$13,040,000	\$0,301,327	49.2	15.7	8.1	02.5	37.4	01.7	24.4	1.5	Acceptable
Paradise Ltd	98	\$12,757	\$1,250,188	\$808,841	48.7	0.9	3.7	8.0	14.2	28.5	12.3	1.2	Recognized

Progenia Ltd	2,112	\$8,067	\$12,092,484	\$5,999,628	40.0	13.2	5.7	10.0	169.0	370.5	210.5	0.8	Acceptable
Progenia Ltd	1,431	\$8,828	\$7,908,275	\$3,448,887	44.1	14.0	9.7	28.0	18.0	147.5	40.5	2.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	877	\$8,272	\$4,712,844	\$2,567,844	53.8	10.3	4.8	9.0	58.0	120.2	84.2	0.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	1,331	\$8,807	\$7,472,817	\$3,084,081	48.9	12.0	4.0	8.0	14.3	230.6	141.4	0.7	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	2,871	\$8,374	\$16,150,204	\$8,224,780	49.3	10.1	0.3	19.4	170.3	466.7	277.4	0.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	1,171	\$8,202	\$7,202,842	\$3,000,480	53.6	13.2	5.5	9.4	88.7	212.0	124.2	0.7	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	1,354	\$8,886	\$10,233,090	\$5,048,060	55.2	12.7	0.0	14.6	172.4	240.5	100.2	1.2	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	878	\$8,883	\$4,412,700	\$2,307,847	52.3	11.2	5.8	12.6	55.6	107.4	51.8	1.1	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	410	\$8,882	\$3,014,788	\$97,003	29.0	8.2	3.8	7.1	6.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	403	\$8,742	\$3,121,640	\$1,032,237	01.0	12.0	5.2	0.2	34.0	88.0	50.8	0.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	245	\$13,822	\$3,083,740	\$1,508,621	44.4	8.8	3.8	0.2	24.7	44.5	38.7	0.0	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	2,912	\$8,189	\$19,871,888	\$1,046,082	44.0	14.0	0.3	10.0	188.8	388.7	230.1	0.7	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	788	\$8,782	\$7,723,702	\$4,077,834	62.0	10.0	5.1	8.8	75.1	160.1	81.0	0.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	384	\$8,440	\$1,445,748	\$1,022,401	65.8	10.1	9.8	28.0	22.0	30.1	14.1	1.0	Exempt
Quannah Ltd	4,003	\$8,008	\$20,000,424	\$10,653,013	63.0	15.4	7.1	13.2	311.0	070.8	304.0	0.0	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	1,808	\$8,208	\$1,728,204	\$3,021,412	68.3	11.0	7.0	17.2	80.5	162.0	02.1	1.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	743	\$7,811	\$3,863,873	\$3,181,888	65.0	12.0	0.8	14.2	01.0	114.3	82.4	1.2	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	627	\$8,822	\$4,701,884	\$1,088,308	42.6	14.4	0.8	12.8	30.0	77.8	40.9	0.0	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	1,477	\$8,839	\$8,888,803	\$4,812,707	60.1	13.0	0.8	13.7	100.3	214.1	107.8	1.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	847	\$8,510	\$4,211,870	\$1,837,808	40.0	13.2	0.8	14.0	40.0	94.1	48.1	1.1	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	184	\$7,312	\$1,109,188	\$900,011	40.7	10.0	0.0	13.8	15.6	27.3	11.9	1.3	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	34,830	\$8,323	\$2,18,371,128	\$100,887,401	40.2	13.8	0.0	10.0	2602.0	4317.0	1814.4	1.4	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	177	\$8,019	\$1,677,859	\$770,354	48.2	10.7	0.2	14.7	16.5	28.5	12.0	1.4	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	887	\$8,738	\$4,023,183	\$2,108,406	93.0	12.1	7.1	16.3	48.8	88.7	41.8	1.1	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	820	\$8,731	\$84,119,880	\$30,328,820	47.3	14.5	0.8	0.8	657.0	1614.8	857.0	0.7	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	2,177	\$8,838	\$14,880,320	\$8,039,087	43.0	15.0	0.0	11.3	130.0	320.8	182.8	0.7	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	872	\$8,828	\$7,080,418	\$3,843,228	64.0	11.3	0.4	14.8	77.2	136.3	59.1	1.3	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	228	\$7,802	\$1,733,258	\$888,880	65.8	11.7	0.0	12.3	19.5	38.0	18.5	1.1	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	1,434	\$8,134	\$8,788,158	\$4,877,243	60.0	13.0	0.0	28.0	12.0	17.0	9.0	2.2	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	888	\$8,088	\$4,240,424	\$1,887,483	40.3	12.0	7.5	6.2	154.0	289.3	130.3	1.1	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	511	\$8,812	\$4,503,443	\$2,188,150	48.1	11.0	5.5	11.0	46.8	92.8	48.8	1.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	287	\$8,278	\$2,082,212	\$1,384,000	62.4	10.2	4.7	8.7	28.1	61.1	32.9	0.0	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	2,888	\$8,039	\$12,210,884	\$8,038,450	48.0	13.0	7.1	14.0	151.2	288.8	138.4	1.1	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	1,164	\$8,880	\$20,030,480	\$11,479,400	44.1	14.2	9.0	10.1	277.7	888.8	380.7	0.7	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	332	\$8,247	\$2,738,004	\$1,458,818	53.2	10.1	5.5	12.1	37.0	60.4	27.5	1.2	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	210	\$8,351	\$1,783,710	\$850,311	64.2	8.5	4.4	9.1	24.7	47.7	23.0	1.1	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	110	\$12,378	\$1,381,680	\$780,059	67.3	8.0	3.2	0.0	15.0	34.4	18.4	0.8	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	1,882	\$8,708	\$12,020,082	\$8,550,130	51.0	15.2	8.3	0.4	2520.5	7708.4	5260.9	0.5	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	381	\$10,849	\$3,842,845	\$1,878,151	48.0	10.1	4.8	8.4	35.7	78.9	42.7	0.8	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	10,088	\$5,818	\$50,758,274	\$28,114,344	43.7	18.5	9.4	21.8	611.0	1074.0	482.2	1.3	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	878	\$8,207	\$5,528,788	\$2,604,040	47.1	12.8	7.4	17.0	60.7	118.0	49.0	1.4	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	6,223	\$5,870	\$30,217,860	\$18,543,544	51.2	15.1	6.3	10.8	412.1	887.8	576.7	0.7	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	1,210	\$8,588	\$8,008,578	\$3,080,282	40.7	12.4	0.3	12.8	88.1	193.0	95.0	1.0	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	354	\$8,075	\$2,858,950	\$1,508,458	52.7	9.0	5.8	12.9	35.8	63.2	27.9	1.3	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	383	\$7,874	\$2,804,582	\$1,388,233	47.2	13.4	5.4	9.0	27.1	87.2	40.1	0.7	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	874	\$8,817	\$9,288,008	\$3,382,514	53.7	12.7	0.0	11.4	72.8	184.0	81.2	0.0	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	394	\$8,940	\$3,518,780	\$1,857,008	52.8	9.8	4.8	0.4	30.1	73.8	37.0	1.0	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	35,553	\$8,510	\$23,148,030	\$103,408,784	45.5	15.2	8.1	901.7	52.0	91.4	39.4	1.3	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	240	\$8,834	\$2,048,180	\$970,020	47.8	11.7	5.3	8.1	30.4	75.8	39.4	0.9	Exempt
Quannah Ltd	237	\$8,035	\$1,804,288	\$873,085	51.1	10.1	5.8	14.2	23.5	40.2	16.7	1.4	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	1,884	\$8,547	\$11,028,148	\$8,238,845	47.5	13.0	8.4	71.2	210.2	200.9	70.3	1.5	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	2,884	\$8,875	\$17,882,450	\$8,773,438	48.8	12.8	8.0	26.2	210.5	302.7	92.2	2.3	Acceptable
Quannah Ltd	177	\$7,803	\$1,414,701	\$820,601	68.0	9.1	4.8	10.0	10.5	30.1	10.7	1.2	Recognized
Quannah Ltd	208	\$8,182	\$2,748,418	\$1,427,017	52.0	7.0	4.7	11.6	37.8	83.6	25.8	1.5	Acceptable

Hunka Ltd	1,000	\$5,058	\$11,007,804	\$5,752,227	49.3	12.7	0.8	14.0	164.3	288.1	133.8	1.2	Acceptable
S And S Cons Ltd	688	\$7,117	\$8,110,000	\$5,752,227	50.7	13.3	7.2	15.7	98.8	123.1	58.0	1.2	Recognized
Sabini Ltd	562	\$6,000	\$3,032,816	\$1,000,000	50.0	11.0	6.0	13.2	31.1	83.7	42.0	1.2	Acceptable
Sabino Ltd	1,203	\$9,033	\$7,000,000	\$4,251,309	54.5	12.0	5.5	0.0	102.0	235.1	122.5	0.0	Acceptable
Sabino Pass Ltd	240	\$9,713	\$2,000,000	\$100,024	37.5	11.4	0.5	33.4	21.0	20.0	7.4	2.0	Recognized
Saint, La Ltd	321	\$8,338	\$2,070,400	\$1,604,192	50.2	0.4	5.5	13.3	14.1	50.4	24.2	1.4	Recognized
Sallado Ltd	1,000	\$0,500	\$1,000,000	\$3,045,780	92.1	13.9	0.5	0.0	2752.7	4070.8	1970.9	1.0	Recognized
Sallado Ltd	291	\$0,500	\$1,000,000	\$10,500	93.1	11.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	Recognized
Sam Kaywin Ltd	431	\$0,100	\$2,007,450	\$1,367,737	80.0	12.1	7.1	17.2	15.0	00.7	25.1	1.4	Recognized
Sammonwood Ltd	122	\$1,241	\$1,127,402	\$781,200	68.3	7.6	4.5	11.3	10.3	27.1	10.0	1.0	Recognized
San Angelo Ltd	18,120	\$1,005	\$14,478,710	\$45,702,002	54.1	15.0	0.1	100.0	14.0	23.0	0.4	1.0	Acceptable
San Antonio Ltd	10,014	\$8,708	\$311,000,214	\$182,368,501	50.4	22.5	7.3	502.0	123.8	226.7	102.0	1.2	Acceptable
San Augustine Ltd	002	\$0,000	\$0,722,400	\$3,440,020	91.3	11.5	5.2	10.2	0.3	122.5	59.3	1.1	Acceptable
San Diego Cons Ltd	8,800	\$0,100	\$11,104,700	\$20,231,002	47.8	17.1	7.8	42.8	314.0	944.0	231.0	1.4	Acceptable
San Diego Ltd	1,845	\$0,401	\$10,020,000	\$4,151,036	41.4	13.7	0.5	12.4	112.0	237.7	124.0	0.0	Acceptable
San Diego Ltd	3,711	\$7,072	\$20,244,102	\$12,413,553	47.3	15.8	0.1	0.0	234.0	608.4	373.0	0.0	Acceptable
San Felipe Ball Rio Cons Ltd	10,481	\$5,000	\$1,301,400	\$20,240,700	47.7	17.2	0.2	45.5	211.8	441.5	225.7	0.0	Acceptable
San Jacinto Ltd	234	\$10,007	\$2,841,778	\$1,200,000	47.8	11.5	3.0	0.7	22.1	60.8	44.8	0.0	Recognized
San Mateo Cons Ltd	7,002	\$5,120	\$43,214,000	\$21,800,831	50.7	15.0	7.3	49.1	102.1	205.8	143.7	1.1	Acceptable
San Pedro Ltd	248	\$0,130	\$2,204,240	\$810,056	30.2	11.8	4.3	0.7	20.8	57.7	30.8	0.0	Recognized
San Pedro Ltd	784	\$7,424	\$3,020,410	\$3,110,743	53.0	11.2	0.8	12.0	70.0	135.2	85.2	1.1	Acceptable
San Vicente Ltd	20	\$23,400	\$300,000	\$232,470	40.8	4.0	2.0	0.7	5.0	8.0	3.0	1.7	Recognized
Sanon Ltd	223	\$0,040	\$2,010,020	\$1,010,024	50.4	10.0	5.1	10.4	22.3	43.7	21.4	1.0	Recognized
Sanford Ltd	074	\$0,030	\$3,000,720	\$3,004,744	47.0	10.8	5.9	11.1	100.3	199.1	70.8	1.0	Recognized
Sanford Ltd	2,100	\$0,284	\$1,010,000	\$0,377,003	41.2	13.5	5.8	10.2	85.0	370.7	211.4	0.8	Acceptable
Sanita Ann Ltd	281	\$8,013	\$2,401,003	\$1,044,707	40.4	11.3	5.8	11.9	24.9	48.4	23.0	1.1	Acceptable
Sanita Ltd	4,470	\$5,007	\$25,000,320	\$12,041,150	40.8	10.8	8.5	17.2	200.4	520.0	200.1	1.0	Acceptable
Sanita Ltd	280	\$12,454	\$3,440,500	\$1,835,035	51.7	8.4	5.2	13.7	33.0	54.8	20.9	1.0	Acceptable
Sanita Marin Ltd	002	\$0,000	\$3,070,702	\$1,820,004	40.0	11.7	0.8	10.2	91.9	88.5	37.1	1.4	Acceptable
Sanita Ron Ltd	1,100	\$0,232	\$2,480,178	\$3,103,434	41.0	14.0	0.7	12.8	85.0	179.0	93.3	0.0	Acceptable
Santo Ltd	480	\$7,187	\$3,814,403	\$1,820,188	40.1	13.2	7.7	10.5	37.0	83.5	20.5	1.4	Recognized
Savoy Ltd	340	\$7,121	\$2,483,800	\$1,108,740	45.0	10.5	5.1	9.0	33.0	87.8	34.9	0.0	Recognized
Schwarz-Cibola U City Ltd	7,207	\$0,007	\$42,504,249	\$20,004,505	40.3	15.4	0.0	21.7	471.2	809.3	335.1	1.4	Recognized
Schwarz Ltd	022	\$7,471	\$4,040,002	\$2,811,503	50.2	10.5	5.1	9.0	59.2	172.0	82.7	0.0	Acceptable
Schulenburg Ltd	750	\$0,884	\$4,000,000	\$2,484,014	40.3	14.1	0.8	12.4	53.2	113.0	80.4	0.0	Recognized
Security-Rosent Ltd	810	\$0,800	\$0,850,144	\$2,620,050	47.3	15.0	7.4	64.7	27.5	40.1	12.0	2.2	Acceptable
Songavos Ltd	508	\$10,048	\$8,070,500	\$3,114,830	52.1	0.3	4.4	8.4	84.0	135.2	71.2	0.0	Acceptable
Sony Ltd	2,304	\$0,150	\$14,001,000	\$8,107,005	55.3	13.5	8.0	9.2	249.4	500.4	200.1	1.0	Acceptable
Soprin Ltd	7,505	\$0,200	\$47,040,005	\$23,020,453	50.0	13.9	0.0	13.7	540.4	1100.7	554.3	1.0	Acceptable
Somnello Ltd	2,102	\$0,071	\$19,440,232	\$8,230,485	47.5	13.1	0.7	10.1	107.3	384.0	217.2	0.8	Acceptable
Somnello Ltd	052	\$0,430	\$5,002,228	\$2,844,052	46.3	10.5	0.0	14.0	92.1	108.7	40.0	1.3	Recognized
Shallowal Ltd	1,205	\$0,241	\$5,002,005	\$3,003,052	51.7	12.7	8.0	21.6	107.0	161.0	50.0	1.7	Acceptable
Shumock Ltd	358	\$8,358	\$2,002,104	\$1,705,377	50.0	0.8	4.2	7.4	30.5	85.2	48.7	0.8	Acceptable
Shurand Ltd	0,751	\$5,000	\$30,871,400	\$20,573,045	51.8	17.0	0.3	1.9	4003.5	7010.9	3812.0	1.1	Recognized
Shelbyville Ltd	714	\$7,451	\$9,320,014	\$2,880,007	50.5	13.1	0.9	14.0	54.5	103.5	49.0	1.1	Acceptable
Shelton Ltd	4,500	\$0,850	\$31,133,001	\$14,507,078	40.8	10.2	8.1	173.0	25.8	52.0	28.2	1.0	Acceptable
Shorland Ltd	1,023	\$5,000	\$10,003,408	\$5,783,300	52.8	13.3	0.0	14.3	144.0	278.7	134.1	1.1	Acceptable
Shorman Ltd	0,303	\$5,075	\$38,018,925	\$20,188,040	50.1	13.0	10.0	37.8	487.0	630.3	168.4	2.8	Acceptable
Shool Ltd	520	\$0,670	\$3,470,345	\$1,087,345	50.1	12.3	5.8	2.4	133.0	351.0	217.4	0.0	Recognized
Shony Ltd	102	\$11,127	\$1,134,034	\$0,70,837	50.0	7.0	4.1	8.0	13.4	24.0	11.5	1.2	Acceptable
Shore Munch Ltd	137	\$10,147	\$1,300,110	\$0,08,105	40.7	10.8	0.0	10.1	12.7	10.0	7.7	1.8	Acceptable
Siebag Ltd	3,007	\$0,140	\$10,034,162	\$8,888,054	46.7	14.8	5.0	9.8	200.3	524.0	315.7	0.7	Recognized
Silverton Ltd	234	\$7,780	\$1,821,024	\$800,305	54.3	0.5	4.4	8.2	24.0	53.2	28.0	0.0	Recognized
Sims Ltd	570	\$0,370	\$3,081,800	\$2,194,360	50.0	12.0	7.3	17.4	45.0	70.2	33.3	1.4	Recognized

Simon Ltd	2,142	\$8,454	\$1,074,468	\$8,095,181	50.8	14.4	6.8	12.8	148.8	315.9	190.3	0.9	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	80	\$8,269	\$865,440	\$8,095,181	48.0	8.4	5.4	15.1	1.5	14.8	5.3	1.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	714	\$8,014	\$4,722,300	\$8,422,112	51.4	13.2	6.8	14.0	54.1	105.0	60.8	1.1	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	1,400	\$8,720	\$8,499,310	\$8,422,112	51.8	11.6	6.2	13.3	120.0	220.3	109.3	1.1	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	200	\$8,107	\$2,389,872	\$1,151,043	48.0	10.2	6.5	11.0	20.0	53.8	24.8	1.2	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	372	\$8,856	\$2,650,000	\$1,685,050	54.4	9.0	6.4	10.1	37.0	50.1	20.5	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	1,004	\$8,800	\$1,110,044	\$6,437,474	48.1	13.6	6.4	4.0	306.1	634.7	476.0	0.7	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	424	\$8,013	\$2,651,112	\$1,424,650	48.6	12.2	6.3	13.0	34.0	65.2	30.5	1.1	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	497	\$7,204	\$1,110,200	\$2,000,000	51.3	10.4	6.8	13.0	47.1	107.7	30.4	1.2	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	2,008	\$8,802	\$12,074,350	\$8,601,340	48.3	13.2	7.2	16.0	187.0	362.2	104.0	1.2	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	3,241	\$8,824	\$18,771,604	\$8,370,274	47.0	33.0	6.8	14.0	101.1	320.7	230.0	0.4	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	3,100	\$8,830	\$19,493,824	\$8,343,357	42.8	16.4	7.3	13.0	213.2	440.0	230.0	0.9	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	800	\$7,018	\$5,284,610	\$2,670,020	48.7	10.6	6.2	10.3	60.2	153.7	67.5	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	930	\$8,235	\$2,089,350	\$2,790,082	48.3	11.0	6.9	10.3	64.6	143.1	68.0	1.4	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	8,931	\$8,450	\$80,253,000	\$34,300,870	50.4	14.0	7.1	35.0	280.2	600.4	280.2	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	170	\$8,402	\$1,441,000	\$2,095,091	58.2	9.2	6.1	11.4	18.0	33.3	14.0	1.2	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	4,070	\$8,207	\$28,023,032	\$13,980,311	48.1	15.7	7.8	15.0	297.8	589.5	301.7	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	8,004	\$8,408	\$83,888,032	\$30,881,300	48.3	15.1	7.7	880.3	21.0	33.0	11.4	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	120	\$11,092	\$1,493,040	\$732,387	52.2	8.0	3.8	8.7	13.3	34.3	21.0	0.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	740	\$7,008	\$5,251,040	\$3,324,453	47.8	10.3	6.0	8.4	70.0	188.8	80.4	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	3,100	\$8,800	\$10,371,100	\$8,093,089	48.5	14.8	7.1	4.7	608.2	1278.7	807.5	0.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	3,004	\$8,028	\$216,757,140	\$111,500,141	51.0	14.3	6.9	13.3	2308.0	4783.3	2475.3	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	84	\$8,733	\$802,002	\$289,439	45.1	13.7	6.4	12.0	6.9	14.7	7.8	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	1,727	\$8,203	\$8,141,011	\$4,080,082	49.0	14.8	9.3	28.0	118.7	189.7	89.0	1.7	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	20,708	\$8,405	\$121,440,040	\$87,207,501	50.0	15.5	8.0	10.5	1727.0	3348.0	1010.0	1.1	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	403	\$8,141	\$5,280,823	\$1,725,713	52.0	10.8	7.3	22.1	37.0	83.2	18.2	2.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	3,805	\$8,215	\$22,100,478	\$11,321,059	51.1	13.0	4.5	12.0	236.5	940.2	283.7	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	204	\$8,800	\$2,844,874	\$1,251,002	47.3	8.4	4.5	9.7	39.0	63.3	30.3	1.2	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	497	\$8,782	\$3,171,884	\$1,680,557	49.2	12.3	5.8	11.0	38.0	80.5	42.9	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	2,838	\$7,014	\$10,005,732	\$10,032,393	50.4	18.1	7.8	18.1	170.3	383.8	187.0	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	888	\$8,021	\$5,398,088	\$2,080,883	53.4	11.2	4.9	7.5	82.3	155.1	72.8	0.7	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	748	\$8,094	\$8,034,312	\$3,239,057	53.5	11.1	5.4	10.5	67.4	138.5	71.1	0.9	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	108	\$13,782	\$1,480,882	\$883,387	50.1	4.8	3.2	9.6	22.1	33.1	11.0	2.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	3,530	\$8,745	\$70,270,880	\$8,887,888	49.3	19.1	8.0	17.0	233.8	441.3	207.5	1.1	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	273	\$11,185	\$3,053,504	\$1,605,378	49.3	8.5	4.3	7.0	28.7	63.5	34.8	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	704	\$8,774	\$5,175,338	\$2,680,123	51.4	11.0	6.8	17.8	60.5	112.4	42.0	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	848	\$7,748	\$5,005,208	\$2,702,812	54.0	11.1	0.1	13.5	58.2	105.9	47.7	1.2	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	203	\$7,041	\$1,420,323	\$71,834	54.0	8.8	0.4	10.2	21.1	31.7	10.8	2.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	360	\$11,046	\$4,288,258	\$2,191,208	51.1	9.4	9.2	11.8	38.2	60.0	30.8	1.2	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	280	\$8,020	\$1,710,011	\$787,189	44.1	11.0	0.1	12.0	22.3	42.5	20.1	1.1	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	4,160	\$8,287	\$78,147,833	\$14,804,232	55.7	13.8	6.8	13.0	305.8	611.0	305.8	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	848	\$10,018	\$7,072,284	\$3,907,248	51.6	10.0	5.1	10.4	54.8	107.5	52.7	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	488	\$8,010	\$4,108,580	\$1,828,015	48.0	12.8	7.8	20.0	35.0	58.5	22.8	1.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	500	\$7,283	\$3,075,078	\$1,787,713	48.1	11.0	5.7	10.8	42.5	88.8	40.3	0.9	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	2,088	\$7,018	\$14,723,704	\$8,581,523	44.7	15.4	6.8	67.0	40.7	78.0	36.2	1.1	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	08	\$8,602	\$832,880	\$385,002	57.7	12.6	8.1	11.0	7.4	15.2	7.8	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	2,218	\$9,302	\$13,077,836	\$7,159,952	51.2	11.7	5.6	10.7	180.0	306.1	200.5	0.9	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	1,454	\$8,717	\$8,700,518	\$4,277,735	43.8	13.1	6.3	12.1	111.0	230.8	110.8	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	710	\$7,704	\$5,630,178	\$2,041,302	53.1	11.2	5.9	11.2	62.4	128.4	84.2	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	1,897	\$5,872	\$10,532,804	\$5,887,883	55.8	13.8	7.0	17.2	130.5	244.3	107.8	1.3	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	1,221	\$7,194	\$8,783,874	\$4,038,150	48.2	14.1	7.2	14.7	80.9	189.8	83.0	1.0	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	3,041	\$8,550	\$10,030,700	\$8,480,015	47.0	14.3	6.5	6.0	212.7	652.0	340.3	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	1,132	\$7,440	\$8,420,872	\$3,038,130	43.4	13.5	6.4	12.2	83.0	178.0	83.0	0.8	Acceptable
Simon Ltd	6,254	\$8,885	\$8,883,710	\$27,108,581	48.0	14.0	8.4	11.8	580.8	1280.7	700.1	0.8	Acceptable

Amelia Ltd	3/78	\$8,534	\$1,214,446	\$1,699,051	52.5	10.4	5.0	20.1	20.9	38.8	18.9	1.1	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/79	\$7,080	\$1,699,051	\$800,287	51.5	10.6	5.2	10.6	18.4	38.9	18.4	1.0	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/84	\$10,181	\$2,040,764	\$1,161,117	43.1	6.8	2.7	4.5	24.1	60.7	30.6	0.7	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	4/75	\$9,755	\$20,103,779	\$12,097,359	46.1	14.5	7.1	13.9	287.0	599.0	300.1	1.0	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	6/79	\$9,470	\$31,328,082	\$14,063,021	44.7	14.9	7.5	15.1	383.8	702.5	370.7	1.0	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	5/84	\$0,041	\$30,644,306	\$10,610,020	40.3	10.1	7.3	13.4	369.5	709.1	434.0	0.8	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	2/83	\$1,143,848	\$6,644,933	\$3,672,372	20.2	20.2	6.6	15.0	14.0	32.0	18.0	0.7	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	1/80	\$9,482	\$1,300,272	\$700,030	51.0	9.2	6.1	11.4	15.9	20.0	12.6	1.2	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	6/24	\$7,400	\$4,007,700	\$2,140,007	52.0	11.8	6.4	14.0	44.4	81.0	37.5	1.2	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	5/80	\$0,802	\$5,070,532	\$1,717,041	46.7	13.2	6.4	12.4	40.0	83.6	43.1	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	6/83	\$7,051	\$5,625,945	\$2,050,381	55.5	11.1	5.1	9.4	02.0	130.3	74.7	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	4/8	\$10,430	\$470,780	\$202,209	50.5	9.0	4.2	11.0	7.0	1.0	4.0	1.8	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/80	\$8,713	\$1,032,087	\$1,020,303	53.1	10.7	4.7	8.4	18.0	42.3	23.7	0.8	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	9/21	\$9,080	\$9,101,408	\$3,314,082	53.8	12.7	8.6	13.3	72.5	141.7	80.2	1.0	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	6/88	\$7,781	\$4,410,008	\$1,772,203	40.1	13.1	6.0	14.0	43.4	82.3	30.0	1.1	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/77	\$5,380	\$915,416	\$355,112	51.4	12.1	7.7	6.2	81.3	180.4	910.1	1.0	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	6/84	\$0,481	\$3,632,834	\$1,004,071	51.2	12.3	7.4	18.0	48.3	80.3	32.0	1.5	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	6/82	\$0,481	\$3,632,812	\$1,114,302	50.4	12.0	7.2	16.8	07.0	118.3	50.7	1.3	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	6/419	\$9,218	\$52,387,040	\$24,427,008	48.7	15.8	8.4	17.0	832.0	1001.8	469.2	1.1	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/214	\$0,390	\$7,767,460	\$3,591,704	48.3	14.8	7.2	14.0	82.0	108.0	80.6	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/47	\$10,084	\$1,870,849	\$884,789	43.0	8.3	4.3	8.0	17.7	34.2	18.5	1.1	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	6/49	\$9,805	\$3,183,300	\$1,695,310	52.0	13.4	8.5	23.2	40.3	03.5	23.2	1.7	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	3/87	\$8,808	\$2,100,713	\$808,105	47.4	11.8	5.9	0.4	607.8	1401.5	733.7	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/180	\$8,321	\$7,480,708	\$3,733,380	48.8	13.8	8.9	12.2	89.3	182.9	97.1	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/820	\$8,480	\$8,989,340	\$3,285,993	48.8	13.5	7.5	10.9	73.0	130.0	80.4	1.3	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/288	\$8,808	\$8,389,020	\$4,100,050	48.0	13.2	7.4	18.8	09.3	170.0	74.7	1.3	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/170	\$7,809	\$9,545,403	\$4,688,880	53.7	11.7	5.5	10.4	00.5	205.3	108.8	0.8	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	3/307	\$5,788	\$19,410,708	\$8,133,100	41.8	17.2	8.9	22.0	184.2	331.1	140.9	1.3	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	2/80	\$7,080	\$1,898,871	\$1,013,887	53.4	10.8	5.4	10.8	24.0	49.8	24.0	1.0	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	14/384	\$5,878	\$4,007,932	\$4,072,697	50.7	13.8	7.5	10.3	103.6	1016.2	883.7	1.2	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	7/12	\$8,378	\$5,541,188	\$2,420,425	53.3	12.7	6.8	9.2	127.1	284.4	137.3	0.9	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	3/49	\$8,740	\$2,352,269	\$1,004,415	42.7	11.7	6.3	13.7	20.8	05.4	25.0	1.2	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	3/202	\$5,788	\$189,022,082	\$80,407,028	48.8	31.8	7.7	10.2	1014.9	4189.0	3175.3	0.3	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	2/82	\$8,356	\$1,732,402	\$873,131	50.4	9.7	5.1	8.2	20.8	45.3	24.8	0.8	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	6/282	\$6,322	\$3,392,804	\$1,012,117	48.4	14.1	6.8	12.4	374.6	800.3	425.7	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	5/3	\$17,140	\$908,420	\$473,287	52.1	5.0	2.8	6.4	10.8	18.9	8.3	1.3	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	5/57	\$7,489	\$4,180,233	\$2,034,354	48.9	14.3	5.5	8.9	39.0	101.3	82.3	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	6/42	\$7,350	\$4,724,478	\$2,628,810	55.8	12.2	7.5	10.5	52.0	85.9	33.0	1.6	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	2/850	\$9,571	\$18,423,878	\$7,880,070	40.5	18.6	7.4	14.1	189.5	399.5	210.0	0.9	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	1/335	\$6,183	\$8,227,805	\$3,801,154	46.2	14.6	6.1	24.2	01.4	148.7	55.3	1.7	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	2/168	\$5,853	\$12,808,104	\$6,078,775	47.1	15.4	7.0	12.8	140.8	300.7	188.9	0.8	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	1/012	\$7,430	\$7,628,268	\$3,022,228	52.1	13.0	7.0	15.2	77.8	144.0	86.7	1.2	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	2/88	\$8,318	\$2,778,870	\$1,371,780	48.4	10.1	4.9	9.5	20.6	60.8	31.3	0.9	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	1/828	\$8,818	\$12,084,488	\$6,453,108	53.4	14.0	7.3	15.3	130.4	250.1	118.7	1.1	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	3/88	\$5,014	\$1,809,884	\$803,500	44.4	12.0	6.8	14.7	25.5	46.4	20.9	1.2	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	2/343	\$8,186	\$14,493,788	\$7,754,182	55.5	12.7	6.9	3.4	578.1	1207.4	680.3	0.8	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	14/437	\$5,873	\$8,478,501	\$4,071,849	55.1	14.6	6.5	11.7	988.8	2221.1	1232.2	0.8	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	5/228	\$8,035	\$31,550,880	\$17,700,100	58.1	14.6	7.3	14.0	358.1	710.2	358.1	1.0	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	04	\$8,016	\$988,594	\$320,880	68.3	14.5	8.7	12.5	6.9	14.0	7.5	0.9	Exempt
Amelia Ltd	15/689	\$8,212	\$87,335,828	\$47,110,541	48.4	14.8	7.3	14.4	1058.7	2148.4	1087.7	1.0	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	2/80	\$8,222	\$2,120,408	\$932,720	43.8	10.2	4.8	9.1	25.4	54.0	28.0	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	1/84	\$9,325	\$1,037,300	\$443,984	42.8	18.8	8.4	15.3	8.8	19.5	19.7	0.8	Recognized
Amelia Ltd	9/44	\$8,006	\$8,238,084	\$3,300,114	43.0	9.7	4.9	0.9	008.3	1830.7	1021.4	0.9	Assegnable
Amelia Ltd	4/830	\$9,203	\$20,900,490	\$13,811,788	48.1	19.4	7.5	3.8	1021.0	2304.7	1283.7	0.8	Assegnable

Wahnet Band Ltd	85	\$7,202	\$1,155,670	\$1,008,401	58.1	14.2	8.7	0.4	120.8	321.0	200.4	0.0	Acceptable
Wahnet Springs Ltd	255	\$6,102	\$1,650,010	\$3,54,021	33.0	14.0	8.6	27.3	18.2	20.7	11.4	1.6	Acceptable
Wairangi Ltd	1,007	\$0,070	\$0,000,040	\$1,402,833	51.0	13.2	7.2	15.8	83.1	182.4	89.3	1.2	Acceptable
Wairangi Ltd	751	\$7,114	\$5,342,014	\$3,120,429	30.9	11.1	5.9	12.0	67.7	127.3	58.0	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	315	\$0,400	\$2,000,000	\$1,362,730	31.1	10.0	6.0	16.7	28.0	47.7	18.0	1.5	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	6,859	\$0,010	\$0,000,000	\$1,000,000	40.1	10.1	7.1	12.7	30.1	225.2	48.1	0.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	0,087	\$0,633	\$4,640,071	\$2,160,446	47.0	15.3	7.0	16.5	456.7	884.4	427.6	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	333	\$7,304	\$5,742,012	\$2,340,231	40.3	12.2	3.8	9.5	40.3	88.4	38.1	1.2	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	999	\$7,430	\$5,000,000	\$2,183,000	40.0	10.8	5.7	12.1	120.4	120.4	38.8	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	588	\$0,002	\$4,483,010	\$2,183,000	40.0	10.3	6.2	16.5	64.2	107.3	83.1	1.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	200	\$0,350	\$2,100,000	\$1,000,000	47.4	12.2	6.3	13.0	21.0	40.0	19.7	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	332	\$0,073	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	48.7	11.8	6.2	13.1	20.1	63.8	28.4	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	14,077	\$0,480	\$0,000,000	\$4,483,010	40.3	15.9	7.0	15.9	109.9	218.0	108.1	1.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	074	\$7,460	\$5,020,040	\$2,400,000	48.7	12.4	5.5	9.9	64.4	122.6	88.2	0.8	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,601	\$0,010	\$0,100,010	\$4,423,208	40.8	10.2	8.0	7.0	240.7	402.1	221.4	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	3,232	\$0,000	\$2,100,000	\$1,000,000	48.0	14.1	5.7	10.0	228.5	303.3	330.6	0.7	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	707	\$0,001	\$12,120,202	\$0,238,870	48.0	14.6	7.2	14.3	131.2	204.2	133.0	1.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	048	\$0,007	\$4,333,170	\$2,804,200	42.8	11.8	8.8	11.0	07.8	130.7	87.8	1.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	103	\$12,320	\$1,002,110	\$0,238,870	48.8	8.0	5.0	11.9	108.5	280.0	181.1	0.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	59	\$10,780	\$0,000,000	\$0,000,000	48.0	9.7	4.2	7.4	17.8	30.8	12.8	1.4	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	130	\$0,134	\$0,134,000	\$4,115,233	42.2	10.8	7.4	1.2	103.4	217.3	111.8	0.8	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,785	\$0,380	\$0,000,000	\$5,238,842	48.0	13.3	7.1	13.2	110.7	251.4	134.7	0.9	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	2,410	\$0,350	\$10,000,000	\$0,000,000	48.0	14.0	8.0	10.5	170.3	418.3	230.0	0.8	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	300	\$0,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,100,000	48.0	10.7	6.0	7.3	41.7	82.7	41.0	1.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	308	\$0,281	\$3,047,008	\$1,423,704	48.0	13.0	9.9	11.1	28.3	81.3	33.0	0.9	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,314	\$0,810	\$7,777,000	\$3,801,013	48.3	14.0	8.3	19.2	80.0	188.1	86.3	1.3	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	4,828	\$5,963	\$2,789,384	\$1,859,312	51.0	14.5	8.0	17.8	333.0	603.9	270.9	1.2	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	353	\$15,030	\$4,602,767	\$2,169,520	47.7	8.1	4.8	11.8	43.0	73.5	30.0	1.5	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	4,008	\$5,484	\$2,702,484	\$1,110,000	48.8	10.1	8.8	19.4	284.4	403.9	211.0	1.2	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,008	\$0,178	\$0,000,000	\$4,000,000	47.1	13.8	8.8	21.9	119.8	189.3	73.5	1.8	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	783	\$0,330	\$4,000,000	\$2,000,000	53.4	12.0	7.9	21.2	82.1	89.3	37.0	1.7	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	202	\$0,003	\$1,810,000	\$0,433,874	52.0	9.4	9.4	12.7	21.9	37.4	16.9	1.4	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,848	\$5,777	\$8,042,708	\$4,841,311	51.0	14.0	6.7	12.8	110.0	231.0	120.5	0.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	18,083	\$5,022	\$8,000,000	\$4,842,777	51.1	13.5	7.4	18.4	1115.8	2030.5	910.8	1.2	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	67	\$11,335	\$7,722,845	\$4,004,071	52.4	9.8	9.1	10.9	7.0	13.1	8.2	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	4,741	\$0,188	\$20,327,820	\$12,447,019	42.1	13.1	8.7	30.8	184.5	330.6	155.1	1.2	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	2,711	\$0,084	\$10,430,004	\$7,702,329	47.4	15.2	7.7	19.0	178.4	352.1	173.7	1.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	3,070	\$0,503	\$20,240,510	\$0,108,230	45.0	14.8	9.8	6.3	517.3	1007.4	490.1	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	102	\$7,094	\$1,400,000	\$0,522,844	48.6	8.0	5.2	14.9	22.8	35.0	12.3	1.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,850	\$7,048	\$13,244,000	\$0,201,189	47.5	13.5	7.8	18.5	139.3	241.0	101.8	1.4	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	482	\$0,002	\$3,385,324	\$1,581,702	47.0	14.0	8.3	7.1	70.9	147.8	68.0	1.2	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	144	\$7,058	\$1,010,352	\$482,707	47.5	12.9	8.9	4.4	27.0	60.7	32.6	0.9	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	309	\$5,739	\$4,245,351	\$2,143,902	50.8	8.2	4.2	8.8	37.7	73.6	35.0	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,477	\$0,008	\$0,000,000	\$5,181,880	57.6	14.0	7.2	14.8	105.5	209.1	89.8	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	993	\$0,005	\$0,010,245	\$3,689,531	51.0	11.1	5.4	10.5	89.5	163.9	90.4	0.9	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	985	\$0,880	\$4,712,800	\$2,441,230	51.8	11.9	8.0	6.4	83.4	200.7	107.2	0.0	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	552	\$0,158	\$5,244,012	\$2,889,087	54.7	11.8	0.3	13.5	72.2	135.2	63.0	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	588	\$7,368	\$4,410,828	\$2,159,820	48.0	12.4	0.5	13.7	48.2	92.0	43.6	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	537	\$7,804	\$0,100,748	\$7,478,732	50.1	10.1	5.2	10.7	53.2	103.3	50.1	1.1	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	121	\$10,280	\$1,244,000	\$7,021,103	50.4	7.2	5.0	14.1	15.7	24.2	8.2	1.9	Exempt
Wairangi Valley Ltd	1,338	\$7,644	\$10,000,872	\$4,883,357	40.4	12.0	5.5	9.8	108.2	243.3	137.1	0.6	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	429	\$7,431	\$0,138,175	\$1,721,322	54.7	11.2	0.4	14.9	37.9	80.4	20.6	1.3	Acceptable
Wairangi Valley Ltd	2,804	\$5,870	\$10,484,718	\$7,021,148	48.1	15.1	0.4	24.9	185.7	208.3	112.0	1.6	Acceptable

Wynn Ltd (Taylor)	0.001	\$4,782	\$31,850,072	\$18,004,801	50.8	15.8	10.1	7.7	418.8	850.8	740.0	1.7	Recognized
Yanika Ltd	383	\$0,317	\$2,419,411	\$1,102,770	40.1	13.4	8.0	10.8	28.0	47.0	10.3	1.5	Recognized
Yonham Ltd	1,507	\$0,224	\$9,774,646	\$5,337,171	54.6	13.8	6.3	11.8	118.1	248.7	122.7	0.8	Recognized
Yorham Ltd	697	\$0,024	\$4,118,322	\$2,621,604	54.6	13.0	7.1	15.0	53.0	98.2	44.0	1.2	Recognized
Ysleta Ltd	46,008	\$1,007	\$284,534,794	\$153,070,730	53.8	45.2	8.0	200.1	181.0	343.1	179.4	0.9	Recognized
Zapala County Ltd	3,163	\$0,000	\$22,039,794	\$11,037,006	52.8	14.1	6.1	10.8	274.3	518.8	294.2	0.8	Recognized
Zavalla Ltd	420	\$0,680	\$2,600,014	\$1,414,685	50.4	13.7	6.7	13.1	41.1	83.0	32.8	1.0	Recognized
Zephyr Ltd	200	\$0,344	\$1,300,804	\$605,262	50.3	10.4	7.0	26.2	10.8	27.1	7.3	2.7	Recognized